



A University of Sussex DPhil thesis

Available online via Sussex Research Online:

<http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by copyright which belongs to the author.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the Author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the Author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Please visit Sussex Research Online for more information and further details

COLLECTORS AND COLLECTING IN ENGLAND c. 1600 – c. 1660

SUSAN CAROLINE BRACKEN

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

2011

VOLUME I

TEXT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>VOLUME I</u>	<u>Page</u>
Abbreviations used in the footnotes.	
Introduction	1
<u>Chapter One: ‘Chyna’, ‘Chinese’ and ‘India’ – Oriental Objects in England Before 1614</u>	13
Porcelain in England	14
Reasons for acquisition	17
The status of porcelain	18
Routes of transmission	19
English Royal inventories	22
Courtiers and their collections	26
Collections in early Seventeenth-century England	28
Two Case Studies: Thomas Arundell and Robert Cecil	30
Objects other than Porcelain: Furnishings and Furniture	36
Conclusion	42
<u>Chapter Two: Collecting and Commissioning Copies and Variants of Masterpieces</u>	45
The concept of the copy	46
The intentions behind the practice of copying	50
Collectors and Copies	55
The historical status of copies and copying	59
Methods of Copying	66
Critics and Commentators on copies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries	72
Emulation and copies	81
Seventeenth-century masters and copying	86
Copies and the problem of Forgery	91
Copies as historical evidence of original works	94
The roles of agents and dealers	100
Artistic training and the role of copies	104
The canon	107

Copies and Diplomacy	114
Artists as Copyists	119
Signatures and Authenticity	127
Sculpted Copies	129
Where copies were displayed and how they were viewed	130
Gallery Paintings	139
Conclusion	141
<u>Chapter Three - English Collectors of Old Master Paintings, Both Originals and Copies</u>	143
Introduction	143
Thomas Howard, 14 th Earl of Arundel	155
The collection of George Villiers, 1 st Duke of Buckingham	158
The Collection of James, 3 rd Marquess and 1 st Duke of Hamilton	167
The collection of Charles I	175
Pricing Copies in the Sale	192
Ham House – a Case Study of a Seventeenth-Century Collection	194
Copies of Old Master Paintings on the London Market 1649-55	201
Artists as Copyists in London	212
Conclusion to Chapter Three	216
<u>Conclusion to Thesis</u>	217
<u>Bibliography</u>	
<u>Appendix One – English Inventories</u>	
<u>Appendix Two – Transcript of 1605 Wardour Castle Inventory</u>	
<u>Appendix Three – Transcript of 1612 Salisbury House Inventory</u>	
<u>Appendix Four – Types of Copy</u>	
<u>VOLUME II</u>	
<u>List of Illustrations</u>	
<u>Illustrations</u>	

ABBREVIATIONS

Original Documents

HH1611 = Hatfield House Inventory 1611

HH1612 = Hatfield House Inventory 1612

HHP = Hatfield House Papers

SH1612 = Salisbury House Inventory 1612 (see complete transcript at Appendix III)

SH1629 = Salisbury House Inventory 1629

WC1605 = Wardour Castle Inventory 1605 (see complete transcript at Appendix II)

Printed Sources

AB = Art Bulletin

AH = Art History

AN = The Art Newspaper

BAJ = British Art Journal

BM = The Burlington Magazine

Baglione = Giovanni Baglione *Le Vite de' pittori, scultori et architetti. Dal pontificato di Gregorio XIII del 1572 in fino a' tempi di papa Urbano Ottavo nel 1642*, critical ed. Jacob Hess and Herwarth Röttgen, 4 vols., Vatican City, 1995.

Bellori = Bellori, G.P., *The Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects, A New Translation and Critical Edition*, A.S. Wohl, H. Wohl, T. Montanari, Cambridge, 2005 and paperback edition 2010.

Brookes 2007 = Brookes, A., 'Richard Symonds's Account of his Visit to Rome in 1649-51', *Walpole Society*, 69, 2007, pp.1-184.

CIA 2006 = *David Teniers and the Theatre of Painting*, exh. cat. Courtauld Institute of Art, 2006, ed. E. Vegelin van Claerbergen.

Cropper 2005 = Elizabeth Cropper, *The Domenichino Affair: Novelty, Imitation, and Theft in Seventeenth-Century Rome*, 2005.

CSPD = Calendar of State Papers Domestic

CSPC = Calendar of State Papers Colonial

HMC = Historic Manuscripts Commission

Humfrey 2007a = Humfrey, P., *Titian*, 2007

Humfrey 2007b = Humfrey, P., *Titian: The Complete Paintings*, Bruges, 2007

JoHoC = Journal of the History of Collections

JWCI = Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes

Loh = Maria H. Loh, *Titian Remade: Repetition and the Transformation of Early Modern Italian Art*, Los Angeles, 2007.

Madrid 2003: *Tiziano*, ed. M. Falomir, exh. cat Prado, 2003.

NG means National Gallery, London; National Galleries elsewhere are identified separately.

NGA, Washington means National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC.

NPG means National Portrait Gallery, London.

ODNB = Oxford Dictionary of National Biography

Sale = 'The Inventories and Valuations of the King's Goods 1649-51', ed. O. Millar, *Walpole Society*, 43, 1972.

Spear 1997: Richard E. Spear, *The Divine Guido: Religion, Sex, Money and Art in the World of Guido Reni*, 1997.

TOCS = Transactions of the Oriental Ceramic Society

van der Doort = *Abraham van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I*, ed. O. Millar, *Walpole Society*, XXXVII, 1958-60.

INTRODUCTION

The field of collecting in England in the seventeenth century has been examined principally through scholarly studies of individual collections. This was the first period in England in which it can be demonstrated that high quality paintings not only dominated the major collections, such as those of Charles I and the Duke of Buckingham, but were themselves the principal motivation for gathering pictures. Few sixteenth-century collections, other than that of John, Lord Lumley, are properly recorded, with many inventories simply listing the number of pictures with no further information.¹ This makes it difficult to assess their contents, but the surviving evidence indicates that the majority were dominated by portraits. Attributions are rare in the sixteenth century and are usually indicative of a recognition of certain famous names, but not a real understanding of their works. One of the significant changes in the seventeenth century is in the recording of collections, where attributions to artists gradually emerge, indicating a new interest in the authorship of paintings, which had generally been absent in the previous century. The most important inventory is that written by Abraham van der Doort of the collection of Charles I, unusual not only because it is concerned principally with paintings, but also because it provides a level of detail about the paintings concerned which had never previously been seen in England.² Many of his attributions remain unchallenged. Information can also be gleaned from some knowledgeable visitors to collections in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Scholars in the twentieth century who have explored the question of collecting in England in the seventeenth century include the seminal work of Oliver Millar in transcribing van der Doort's inventory and the documents for the sale of the king's collection.³ There have been important individual studies by Mary Beal and Anne Brookes of the notes on paintings made by Richard Symonds, the traveller and writer on Italy.⁴ Paul Shakeshaft has written on the formation of the Hamilton collection,⁵ Philip McEvonsoneya on the

¹ *Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age: The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree*, ed. M. Evans, 2010 (hereafter "Lumley").

² 'Abraham van der Doort's Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I', ed. O. Millar, *Walpole Society*, 37, 1958-60, hereafter "van der Doort".

³ 'The Inventories and Valuations of the King's Goods 1649-1651', ed. O. Millar, *Walpole Society*, 43, 1970-72, hereafter "Sale".

⁴ Beal, M., *A study of Richard Symonds: his Italian notebooks and their relevance to seventeenth century-painting techniques*, New York, 1984. Brookes, A., 'Richard Symonds's Account of his Visit to Rome in 1649-51', *Walpole Society*, 69, 2007, pp.1-184.

⁵ Shakeshaft, P., 'To much bewiched with thoes intysing things': the letters of James, third

dispersal of the Buckingham collection,⁶ Timothy Wilks on the collection formed by Prince Henry and other aspects of the royal collection.⁷ Several scholars, such as Shakeshaft and Robert Hill, have explored the role played by ambassadors, such as Carleton and Wotton.⁸ Arthur MacGregor has ranged more widely both in types of object collected and geographically in two major publications on collecting and the beginnings of the modern museum, as well as an examination of the collection of Charles I.⁹ Other studies, notably that of Lucy Gent, have examined English attitudes to art and collecting through the literature of the period and the amassing of libraries.¹⁰

Copies have generally been given little consideration in these studies, which have tended to concentrate on original works, despite references to considerable numbers of copies in seventeenth-century documents. The presence of copies of history paintings by some of the most famous artists of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is one of the defining features of a new kind of collecting in England at this time, with the involvement of collectors who were aware of the status of the works they acquired or commissioned. The subtle distinctions between different types of copy and variant have not been fully explored, but are addressed in what follows.

This thesis will examine all aspects of the copy in detail and present this aspect of collecting in such a way as to re-shape perceptions of collecting as a whole. The first chapter will use the example of “Chyna” to show how collecting objects from remote

Marquis of Hamilton and Basil, Viscount Feilding, concerning collecting in Venice 1635-1639’, *BM*, 128, 1986, pp. 114-134.

⁶ McEvansoneya, P., ‘An Unpublished Inventory of the Hamilton Collection in the 1620s and the Duke of Buckingham’s pictures’, *BM*, CXXIV (Aug. 1992). McEvansoneya, P., ‘Vertue, Walpole and the Documentation of the Buckingham Collection’, *Journal of the History of Collections*, 8, 1, 1996, pp.1-14.

McEvansoneya, P., ‘Italian Paintings in the Buckingham Collection’ in *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, ed. E. Chaney, 2003, pp.315-336.

⁷ Wilks, T., *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern Europe*, 2007; Wilks T., ‘Paying Special Attention to the Adorning of a Most Beautiful Gallery’: The Pictures in St. James’s Palace, 1609-49’, *The Court Historian*, 10, 2005, pp.149-172.

⁸ Shakeshaft, P., *The English Ambassadors in Venice 1604-1639*, MA report Courtauld Institute 1979. Hill, R., ‘Ambassadors and Art Collecting in Early Stuart Britain: The Parallel Careers of William Trumbull and Sir Dudley Carleton 1609-25’ *Journal of the History of Collections* 15, 2003.

⁹ *The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe*, eds., O. Impey and A. MacGregor, 2nd edition, 2001; *The Late King’s Goods: Collections, Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*, ed. A. MacGregor, 1989; MacGregor, A., *Curiosity and Enlightenment: Collectors and Collections from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century*, 2007.

¹⁰ Gent, L., *Picture and Poetry 1560-1620: Relations between literature and the visual arts in the English Renaissance*, Leamington Spa, 1981; Gent, L., ‘Marcus Gheeraerdt’s Captain Thomas Lee’ in *Dealing with the Visual: Art History, Aesthetics and Visual Culture*, eds. C. van Eck and E. Winters, Aldershot, 2005, pp.85-108.

cultures, misunderstood by Europeans, began earlier than is usually supposed in England and quickly became fashionable. This reveals issues of the values placed on the 'exotic', efforts at devising language to describe the unfamiliar and the fashion for creating imitations from the original.

It forms a useful prelude to Chapter Two, an examination of the copying and dissemination of the perceived canon of great European masters, both within Italy and outside it. Copies of major works of art have been in existence since antiquity and the history and concept of copies will be discussed, including some examples of sculpture. The thesis will discuss methods of reproduction of oil paintings and will include material over a wide date range from the 15th to the 18th century, in order to demonstrate a gradual shift in attitudes towards copying. It will show that many artists, including some of the most highly-regarded of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, were involved in the production of copies and variants and developed their skills in emulating the great masters of the past. The reactions towards copies and copying of contemporary critics and commentators will also be considered. The relative status of works emanating from the studios of great sixteenth and seventeenth-century artists, as well as the importance of copying in artistic training will be discussed and will be shown to have raised the status of the copy. In fact, copies of highly-prized works were regularly given as diplomatic gifts, with the knowledge of the recipients.

The third chapter will focus on practices of collecting and copying in England from c. 1600 to 1660. In order to investigate the acceptance of copies into the major English collections, this thesis will have established their earlier presence in many important European collections and show that they were usually integrated into the collection together with original works. The role of specialists who were exclusively engaged in making copies will be examined. Where inventories and sales catalogues survive, evidence will be presented to demonstrate the existence of a wide variety of different types of copy in notable English collections of the first half of the seventeenth century, copies which, far from being considered secondary or inferior, were identified as such by their owners. In addition, the burgeoning art market in London in the early 1650s, emerging in the aftermath of the execution of Charles I and the dispersal of his collection, will be explored.

The art market and the prices paid for original paintings and for copies in the Low Countries have been thoroughly explored by Neil De Marchi and Hans van Miegroet in

their important joint essays: ‘Pricing invention: “Originals,” “Copies,” and their Relative Value in Seventeenth Century Netherlandish Art Markets’ (1996) and ‘Art, Value, and Market Practices in the Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century’ (1994).¹¹ These have investigated the relative values of “originals” and “copies” on the sophisticated art markets of Antwerp and Amsterdam, markets which operated very differently from the still undeveloped field of auctions and dealers in London during the period under discussion. Antwerp, for example, had weekly public auctions and the upper gallery of the Bourse ‘was the first permanent art market in Europe’ by 1540.¹² Nothing of this kind would be found in London during the period under discussion, which makes a direct comparison with De Marchi and van Miegroet’s findings impossible. Another difference between the circumstances which pertained in the Low Countries and those in London at this time was the power of the local artists’ guilds, for which we have little surviving evidence in London.¹³ Despite these differences, a number of De Marchi and van Miegroet’s very pertinent comments will be discussed below where appropriate. It is noteworthy that their findings reveal that ‘originals often sold for only two or three times the price of a copy’, especially where the copyist was also the painter of the original, a situation which they rightly strongly contrast with twentieth-century art market circumstances, where the original would ‘sell at auction for hundreds of times the value of copies’.¹⁴ Prices on the secondary market in London in the 1650s varied much more widely, as will be shown below.

It is hoped that what the thesis will have achieved, therefore, is a re-positioning of our concept of ‘original’ and ‘copy’ in the context of the early 17th century. Whilst the enormous amount of scholarship that has been expended on correcting the supposed ‘mistakes’ of early catalogues is highly valuable, this may have, at least in part, been missing the point. Collecting works by certain famous masters was all-important and the fame of an artist could be present in a collection as much through a copy as an original. Seventeenth-century patrons had a clear and sophisticated notion of what their collections should contain and, recognising the impossibility of acquiring some ancient, as well as

¹¹ De Marchi, N. and H.J. van Miegroet, ‘Pricing Invention: “Originals,” “Copies,” ...’ in *Economics of the arts: selected essays*, eds. V.A. Ginsburgh and P-M. Menger, Amsterdam, 1996, pp.26-70, and De Marchi, N., and H.J. van Miegroet, ‘Art, Value and Market Prices...’, *AB*, 76, 1994, pp.451-464.

¹² Van Houdt, T., ‘The Economics of Art in Early Modern Times: Some Humanist and Scholastic Approaches’ in *Economic Engagements with Art*, eds., N. De Marchi and C.D.W. Goodwin, Durham NC, 1999, pp.303-331.

¹³ This lack is to some extent due to the destruction of records in the Great Fire of 1666.

¹⁴ De Marchi and Van Miegroet, 1996, p.28.

more recent, masterpieces were prepared to commission or acquire copies of them. As Jean Baudrillard commented in his essay on 'The System of Collecting': 'whilst the appropriation of a 'rare' or 'unique' object is obviously the perfect culmination of the impulse to possess...one can never find absolute proof in the real world that a given object is indeed unique'. As he goes on to point out: 'what makes a collection transcend mere accumulation...[is] the fact that it *lacks* something'.¹⁵ This sense of lacking something contributed to the collecting of copies of unattainable works of art discussed in this thesis.

Copying by mechanical means is not the focus of this thesis, however, it has been the subject of discussion amongst art historians since the second half of the twentieth century. Walter Benjamin's seminal article 'The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility' was finally published in German in 1955, an abbreviated earlier version having appeared in French in 1936.¹⁶ The 1955 publication was 15 years after Benjamin's death and represented the third version of the essay. Benjamin's recent editors suggest that he never regarded this essay as finished.¹⁷ Benjamin wrote the essay from the point of view of someone long associated with left-wing politics and bitterly opposed to the rise of Fascism, which he believed must be opposed at all costs.¹⁸

In his opening remarks, Benjamin posited that:

'traditional concepts – such as creativity and genius, eternal value and mystery...used in an uncontrolled way...allow factual material to be manipulated in the interests of fascism.'¹⁹

He believed that 'theses defining the developmental tendencies of art can therefore contribute to the political struggle'.²⁰ In a letter of October 1935 about the essay, Benjamin stated that:

¹⁵ Baudrillard, J., 'The System of Collecting' in *The Cultures of Collecting*, eds. J. Elsner and R. Cardinal, 1994, pp.7-24, pp.11,23.

¹⁶ *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings*, eds. H. Eiland and M.W. Jennings, 4v., (hereafter "Benjamin"), 3: 1935-38, (2002), p.429.

¹⁷ *ibid.*

¹⁸ Having gone into exile, Benjamin lost all his possessions in Berlin. His friends and family were also persecuted by the Nazis.

¹⁹ Benjamin, v.4: 1938-40., p.252.

²⁰ *ibid.*

‘art’s fateful hour has struck, and I have captured its signature in a series of preliminary reflections...[which] attempt to give the questions raised by art theory a truly contemporary form’.²¹

It is the contemporary, the modern and the idea of progress towards a new political world in the twentieth century which underlies his thinking in this essay.

Benjamin discusses the fact that ‘art has always been reproducible’, giving a very brief historical survey prior to the developments of photography and cinema, which were the most significant in his opinion. Benjamin goes on to acknowledge that ‘even the most perfect reproductions’ cannot convey the history of the object ‘which underlies the concept of its authenticity’.²² Perhaps deliberately, Benjamin uses the terms “here and now” and “history” as though they are interchangeable. In a footnote, he goes on to state that:

‘a medieval picture of the Madonna at the time it was created could not yet be said to be “authentic”. It became “authentic” only during the succeeding centuries...most strikingly so during the nineteenth.’²³

Although this is not the principal thrust of this thesis, a number of references cited below will demonstrate the very powerful belief in the indisputable authenticity of several painted works, some of which were held to be *acheropita*, which led directly to painted copies being made of them from at least the fifteenth century on (see Chapter Two, pp.114-116).²⁴ Those copies were believed to retain certain qualities intrinsic to the original, such as those associated with miracle-working originals, despite the copies being intended for other locations, even in other countries. Such beliefs in the power of the copies run directly counter to Benjamin’s proposal that copies deprive the original of its “aura”.

Benjamin believed that:

²¹ Benjamin, v. 3, pp.424-425.

²² Benjamin, v. 4, p.253.

²³ Benjamin, v. 4., p.271, n.4.

²⁴ That is, not made by human hand.

‘the authentic work retains its full authority in the face of a reproduction made by hand, which it generally brands a forgery, this is not the case with technological reproduction’.

Although forgery will be discussed below, this thesis is concerned with copies, “made by hand”, which were not made for that purpose; non-fraudulent copies in fact constituted the majority during the period under discussion. Benjamin went on to cite the advantages of “technological” reproduction, in particular the concept that the work of art (he mentions a cathedral) can ‘be received in the studio of an art lover’. He does not fully address the way in which a work of art may lose some of its meaning in this process; amongst a variety of questions which this raises, the loss of scale entailed in the reproduction of a cathedral would inhibit the understanding of the building in question, for example, on the part of someone who had never seen such a structure other than in reproduction. Benjamin believed that the detachment of ‘the reproduced object from the sphere of tradition’ through multiple replication was to be celebrated, but whether his intention was also that the masses should view the resulting images without any comprehension of their originally intended meaning is not entirely clear.²⁵ The latter is suggested by the statement that: ‘at the movies, the evaluating attitude requires no attention.’²⁶ He placed emphasis on the ‘passionate concern’ of the ‘present-day masses...for overcoming each thing’s uniqueness by assimilating it as a reproduction’.²⁷ Benjamin views the reaction of the masses to paintings, even by a contemporary artist like Picasso, as ‘backward’, versus a ‘progressive’ reaction to film. Although he does not explicitly say so, he presumably means that attitudes to Picasso’s work gave it the ‘cult value’ to which he was so profoundly opposed. He goes on to say that paintings were never intended for mass viewing and that despite the presentation of ‘paintings to the masses in galleries and salons, this mode of reception gives the masses no means of organizing and regulating their response’.²⁸ One can only guess at the ways in which Benjamin might have responded to more recent developments such as television, the personal computer and the Internet.

Benjamin focuses much of his enthusiasm for the ‘destruction of the aura’ on the concept that ‘the unique value of the “authentic” work of art has its basis in ritual’, seeing works of

²⁵ Benjamin, 4, p.254.

²⁶ Benjamin, 4, p.269.

²⁷ Benjamin, 4, p.255.

²⁸ Benjamin, 4, pp.264-265.

art as being in a state of ‘parasitical subservience to ritual’, by which he intends religious ritual.²⁹ The only painting he discusses in detail is Raphael’s *Sistine Madonna* [Dresden], where the information he cites is incorrect, in particular the references to “Pope Sixtus”; it is surprising that neither he nor his advisors corrected this to Pope Julius II.³⁰ In a footnote, Benjamin briefly discusses secular works, where he states that authenticity ‘functions as a determining factor [and] displaces the cult value of the work’, which he particularly associates with the collector.³¹ It will be demonstrated below that authenticity was not the only criterion by which seventeenth-century collectors judged the works entering their collections and that they also welcomed copies.

A number of scholars have returned to Benjamin’s essay as part of their consideration of the production of copies in earlier periods. Among them, Megan Holmes, in her discussion of the production of copies in fifteenth-century Florence, has suggested that the ‘circulation of...reproductions...would have reflected back on the originals, endowing them with greater authority’. She notes that whereas Benjamin viewed with approval the democratisation of art in the twentieth century through mechanical reproduction, later scholars have ‘felt compelled to respond...by demonstrating how the copy too could possess aura’.³² Holmes’ essay will be further discussed in Chapter Two.

Some of the issues discussed in this thesis have also been considered in Elizabeth Cropper’s important book *The Domenichino Affair: Novelty, Imitation, and Theft in Seventeenth-Century Rome*, 2005.³³ In this case, the painter Lanfranco who was Domenichino’s rival for important public commissions, publicly accused him of plagiarism, stating that Domenichino had stolen the composition of his *Last Communion of St. Jerome* from that of his master Agostino Carracci. This issue will be discussed in Chapter Two (see pp.83-86). It should be noted that the accusation of plagiarism was not levelled at any of the paintings discussed here in English collections. Cropper’s book is concerned with a specific instance, which does not revolve around works made for collectors but works made as altarpieces and she analyses complex reasons for their appearance which have to do with

²⁹ Benjamin, 4, p.256.

³⁰ Benjamin, 4, p.273. n.15.

³¹ Benjamin 4, p.272, n.12.

³² Holmes, M., ‘Copying Practices and Marketing Strategies in a Fifteenth-Century Florentine Painter’s Workshop’ in *Artistic Exchange and Cultural Translation in the Italian Renaissance City* eds. S.J. Campbell and S.J. Milner, Cambridge, 2004, pp.38-74, pp.51,63.

³³ Hereafter “Cropper 2005”.

their function and with Catholic observance which are not relevant to the works discussed here. Cropper also demonstrates the ways in which artistic rivalry in seventeenth-century Rome operated and sites the criticisms of Domenichino's painting 'within...literary imitation in the Renaissance'³⁴, carefully analysing the influence of contemporary Italian poetry upon the behaviour of some of the participants, which is beyond the scope of this thesis, as no such influence can be detected upon the English collectors discussed here.

Another recent contribution to the debate is that made by Maria H. Loh in 2007.³⁵ Loh's book examines the way in which Alessandro Varotari, "il Padovanino", modelled himself on Titian. Padovanino did this both by directly copying Titian (the *Bacchanals* painted for Ferrara, which are discussed below) and by emulating Titian's style and subject matter in other instances. Loh is concerned not only with the specific case of Padovanino and his practice of copying Titian, but also with attempting to connect Padovanino's 'repetitions' of works by Titian to recent theoretical approaches, involving amongst other examples Terry Gilliam's film *Twelve Monkeys*. Her statement that 'the heroic narrative of twentieth-century avant-gardism is still a far cry from the historical experience of an artist like Padovanino' seems to run contrary to the abrupt switch of direction in her book from the seventeenth to the twentieth century.³⁶ Although well-argued, many of these concepts are outside the scope of this thesis. In her references to film, of course, Loh bases some of her argument on the ideas put forward by Benjamin, although she claims that Benjamin is not an important source for her.³⁷

Loh appears to misunderstand Benjamin's essay when she states that 'Benjamin feared that reproductions would end up as commodified substitutes supplanting original or authentic experiences'; nothing that Benjamin says indicates any fear, but a celebration of the changes to be brought about by mass reproduction. Loh is, however, correct in stating that he 'overemphasized...the loss of aura from original to reproduction'. A number of reviewers have pointed out that Loh's basic premise is flawed by an insistence on Titian as sole author of the *Dresden Venus*, whereas Padovanino might have believed it to be by Giorgione. Loh does not offer a clear explanation of her decision to insist on Titian's

³⁴ Cropper 2005, p.100

³⁵ Maria H. Loh, *Titian Remade: Repetition and the Transformation of Early Modern Italian Art*, Los Angeles, 2007 (hereafter "Loh").

³⁶ Loh 2007 p.8.

³⁷ Ibid.

authorship. Her discussion of the use value versus the exhibition value of the *Dresden Venus* includes that statement ‘it seems rather far-fetched to commission someone of Titian’s reputation to paint an erotic image [for the purpose of stimulating sexual desire]’.³⁸ Having dated the picture 1508-10, the question should have arisen as to what Titian’s reputation is likely to have been at such an early date, with few major projects yet awarded to him, but this aspect is not brought into the discussion. The terms ‘use value’ and ‘exhibition value’ derive from Benjamin’s essay, but this is not acknowledged. Obviously, admitting that Giorgione may have been the original author of this painting would considerably weaken her argument, but it is a possibility which should have been acknowledged. Other than the *Dresden Venus*, Titian’s *Bacchanals* [now divided between the National Gallery and the Prado] are the paintings copied by Padovanino to which Loh devotes most attention. Loh’s book would have been strengthened by reflecting on the experiences of other seventeenth-century artists who copied Titian; instead, she states that Padovanino’s experience ‘was fundamentally different from that of Poussin, Rubens, or van Dyck. What Rome offered Padovanino, but not these other painters, was critical distance’.³⁹ In speaking here of Padovanino copying the *Bacchanals* (which were all in Rome between 1598 and 1637), Loh offers no explanation of this statement, which implies that none of the other artists mentioned was capable of such artistic detachment, despite the fact that they all worked in Rome. Whereas Jeremy Wood believes that Rubens would not easily have obtained access to these paintings whilst they were in the Aldobrandini collection in Rome, Loh offers no explanation as to how Padovanino, whose network of contacts in Rome appears much less influential than that of Rubens, managed to do so.⁴⁰ Nor does she propose any method by which Padovanino might have made these copies. As they are very close in scale to the originals, some form of tracing seems the most likely explanation.⁴¹ In her Conclusion, Loh states that in copying the *Bacchanals* and subsequently keeping those copies in Venice, Padovanino was ‘return[ing]...Titian’s early style to...Venice...Padovanino was the missing link that reconnected Venetian artists with their past’.⁴² This statement is only true of the *Bacchanals*, rather than Titian’s altarpieces, and the *Bacchanals* were not made for Venice, but for Ferrara. It would be equally valid to explore this concept in relation to Titian’s works made for Charles V and Philip II which

³⁸ Loh 2007 p.43.

³⁹ Loh, 2007, p.13.

⁴⁰ Wood, J., *Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard*, pt. 26, ‘Rubens Copies and Adaptations from Renaissance and Later Artists: Italian Artists – I. Raphael and his School’, 2v., 2010, I, p.52.

⁴¹ Tracing is discussed below in Chapter Two p.66.

⁴² Loh, 2007, p.163.

remain where they have always been in Madrid. Loh proposes that ‘there was always an awareness that the “copies” after Titian or others were also ‘originals’ by, say, Padovanino, or Rubens’.⁴³ This was certainly true of Rubens’ copies, but it is doubtful that this statement can be applied with equal force to works by Padovanino, or the many other copyists working in the seventeenth century.

This thesis will show that in the field of collecting in England, something which underwent a seismic change in the early seventeenth century, collectors created a new market for copies of paintings and Oriental objects, causing artists, agents and dealers to follow their lead.

⁴³ Loh, 2007, p.11.

CHAPTER ONE: ‘CHYNA’, ‘CHINESE’ AND ‘INDIA’ – ORIENTAL OBJECTS IN ENGLAND BEFORE 1614⁴⁴

It is usually assumed that objects from the Far East were extremely rare in Northern Europe before the middle of the seventeenth century, the principal objective of trade being spices.⁴⁵ This chapter seeks to demonstrate that this is not the case and that a variety of objects loosely described in inventories as ‘chyna’, Chinese or Indian were in England before 1614; 1614 is the first recorded year of public auctions by the East India Company, during the brief period of direct trade with Japan (1613-23), although the auction records are incomplete.⁴⁶ No clear distinction was understood at that time between countries as widely divergent as India and Japan and terms such as Indian or Chinese, rather than Japanese, were used indiscriminately. In 1616 Thomas Roe, ambassador of James I, wrote from India to the Earl of Southampton ‘I thought all India a China shop, and I should furnish all my friends with rarities but this is not that part’, revealing his lack of understanding of local geography; this is further demonstrated by his comment ‘Here are none of the rarities of India, they all come from the Eastern part...’.⁴⁷ Much of what follows is derived from inventories which were made for a variety of reasons, often because of a death or a change of household personnel, but sometimes their purpose cannot now be determined. The descriptive language used varies considerably; those inventories taken for probate tend not to be written by such well-informed persons as those inventories compiled for a living owner, who would supervise the process. The objects described as ‘chyna’ in inventories taken at this time include porcelain, fabrics, furniture, and “targets”; there are references to “wicker chyna” targets in Salisbury House Inventory of 1612 (hereafter “SH1612”), although these could be Turkish.⁴⁸ However, Jan Huyghen van Linschoten, whose account of his voyages to the East, starting in 1576, was translated into English by John Wolfe in 1596, referred to lacquer targets being available.⁴⁹ Few of these objects can still be

⁴⁴ I have discussed some of this in a brief article: Bracken, S., ‘Chyna in England before 1614’, *Oriental Art*, 47, 2001, p.8-10 (hereafter ‘Bracken 2001’), however, most of what follows is new or expands or amends what was said then.

⁴⁵ Thus the parameters of the exhibition at the British Museum in 1990: *Porcelain for Palaces: The Fashion for Japan in Europe 1650-1750*, exh. cat., London, 1990.

⁴⁶ Impey, O., and C. Jörg, *Japanese Export Lacquer 1580-1850*, Amsterdam, 2005, pp.236-7.

⁴⁷ *The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe to the court of the Great Moghul 1615-19*, ed. W. Foster, 1967 reprint, p.134.

⁴⁸ *Süleyman the Magnificent*, exh. cat. British Museum 1988, Rogers, J.M. and Ward, R.M. eds., p.152.

⁴⁹ Impey, O., ‘Japanese export lacquer of the 17th century’, *Lacquerwork in Asia and Beyond*, ed. W. Watson, 1982, p. 125.

identified today. The relative durability of porcelain means that more of these objects can tentatively be identified; as porcelain was not being made in Japan at this time, all references were to what we now know to be Chinese porcelain.⁵⁰ The Chinese objects in the inventory taken in June, 1614 on the death of the Earl of Northampton have usually been assumed to be the earliest recorded in the household of a prominent courtier, but some earlier examples will be discussed below.⁵¹ Values are very seldom given and when they are it is usually for the value of the silver or silver-gilt mounts and not for the porcelain itself.

Porcelain in England

The word “porcelain” first appears in English in 1530 and “china”, in the sense of ceramics, in 1600.⁵² Ralph Fitch, one of the few Englishmen to visit India before the formation of the East India Company, reported that ‘To Martavan... come many ships from Malacca laden with sandall, porcelanes, and other wares of China’.⁵³ In *Measure for Measure*, first performed at Court on 26 December 1604, Pompey the tapster’s “evidence” to the magistrate refers to ‘a fruit dish...your honours have seen such dishes, they are not china dishes, but very good dishes’.⁵⁴ This would suggest that porcelain was generally known to be the superior material for dishes of all sorts and was already widely available, if it was in use in a tavern. If this interpretation is correct, it seems unlikely that this can have resulted only from the first successful voyage of the East India Company, under the command of Captain James Lancaster, which returned in September, 1603, with cargo consisting mainly of pepper. However, contacts with countries bordering the eastern Mediterranean may have been important and the treaty signed with Turkey in 1581 may have encouraged trade. The preparations for a triumphal entry into London for James I in March 1603, which was cancelled, included the payment of £60 for ‘A newe Chariott for the Quene viz for Paintinge and guildinge the saide Chariott and the furniture with Chiney woorke’, presumably to resemble lacquer (see further below for imitations of lacquer).⁵⁵

⁵⁰ Impey, O., *The Early Porcelain Kilns of Japan: Arita in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century* Oxford, 1996.

⁵¹ Irwin, J., ‘A Jacobean Vogue for Oriental Lacquer-Ware’, *BM*, 95, 1953, pp.193-5.

⁵² Oxford English Dictionary, v. 3, 12, Oxford, 1989.

⁵³ *Early Travels in India*, ed. W. Foster, 1921, p.34. Hawkins also described the inter-country trade carried on by the ‘Portugals’, p.41.

⁵⁴ Act 2, Scene 1, *The New Cambridge Shakespeare*, ed. Brian Gibbons, Cambridge, 1991, p.1.

⁵⁵ PRO E351/3145.

The recently re-discovered text by Ben Jonson for the ceremonial opening by James I of “Britain’s Burse”, built by Robert Cecil in the Strand, lists the objects from “China” to be found in that emporium. A long list of what could be obtained from the ‘China man’ includes:

‘Cabinetts, Caskets, Umbrellas...Estrich Egges...Purslane dishes...Basons,
Ewers...voyders...Targets’

and asserts that:

‘Not a peece of Pursla[ne] about this towne, but is most false and adulterate, except what you see on this shelve...you can put noe poyson in these, but they presently breake...’.⁵⁶

A somewhat confused description of the manufacture of porcelain follows, but significantly it is described as ‘tralucet as Amber and subtler than Christall...Tis for the hand of a Kings daughter or a queene of Aegipt.’, emphasising those qualities of hard-paste porcelain still admired by collectors today and clearly indicating that it was not to be handled by those of the lower social orders.⁵⁷ Jonson continues:

‘O your Chinese! The onely wise nation under the Sun: They had the knowledge of all manner of Arts and letters, many thousand yeares, before any of these parts could speake...I assure you he that would study but the Allegory of a China shop, might stand worthely to be the Rector of an Academy.’

The following year, in *Epicoene or the Silent Woman* Jonson was able to refer frequently to “China-houses”, that is shops selling Oriental goods, and to a “China-woman”, without further explanation, confident that a rather wider audience than that for the opening of the Burse was sufficiently sophisticated to easily understand the references. La Foole states that she was ‘the rich china-woman that the courtiers visited so often, that gave the rare entertainment.’, which implies that this particular trade was both profitable and fashionable.⁵⁸ There were few other comments at the time, but this aspect would later be developed in plays such as William Wycherley’s *The Country Wife*.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ Knowles, J., ‘Jonson’s *Entertainment at Britain’s Burse*’, in *Re-Presenting Ben Jonson: Text, History, Performance*, Basingstoke, 1999, pp.114-151, 134.

⁵⁷ Knowles, op. cit., p.144 suggests that this description is based on Gonzalez de Mendoza, *The History of the Great and Mightie Kingdom of China*, trans. R. Parke, 1588.

⁵⁸ Act One, Scene Four, Jonson, B. *The Silent Woman or Epicoene*, S. Trussler, ed., 1989.

⁵⁹ First performed 1675.

In May 1609, the East India Company gave a feast on board the *Trades Encrease* prior to its departure for the Far East with the *Peppercorn* in March 1610 under the command of Sir Henry Middleton, at which the guests, including James I, ‘were Banquetted at a long Table in the halfe decke, plenteously furnished with delicates served in fine China Dishes, all which were freely permitted to be carried away by all persons’.⁶⁰

The East India Company’s early attempts at establishing regular trade with Far Eastern countries were fraught with misunderstandings and often marred by violent clashes with the local inhabitants, as well as with the Dutch, who were determined to wrest control from the Portuguese and keep the English out. Jonson referred to this in the *Burse* text:

‘such subtiltyes, which you will thinke to have cheape now at the next returne of the Hollanders fleete from the Indyas; But I assure you my factors from lygourne have advertised that [John Ward, the English pirate] hath made such a spoyle in the pursland, as it is thought they will come whom verye much dissolved.’⁶¹

There was a failure to perceive that Western goods were not much in demand and consequently, but not very surprisingly, attempts to interest the Japanese in English broadcloth were largely unsuccessful. The Company sent John Saris to Japan, arriving in 1613, but his dislike for William Adams, who had been resident in Japan since 1600 led Saris to disregard his advice. Adams had arrived as the pilot of the first Dutch vessel in Japan, *De Liefde*, was favoured by the Shogun and spoke the language.⁶² Saris’ errors of judgement led to the British being confined to Hirado by 1616 to the detriment of trade.⁶³ His recommendations also led to an attempt by the Company to export paintings to India and Japan, including images of Venus, of which Saris had taken an example ‘verye lasiuiously sett out’ with him in 1613.⁶⁴ Saris also acquired ten screens in Japan [lost].

⁶⁰ *Annales or a Generall Chronicle of England begun by John Stow, continued & augmented to 1631 by Edmund Howes, Gent.*, 1631, p.994.

⁶¹ Knowles op. cit. 136.

⁶² Farrington, A., *Trading Places: The East India Company and Asia 1600-1834*, exh. cat. 2002, pp.44-45.

⁶³ Impey and Jörg, op. cit., p.25.

⁶⁴ Screech, T., “Pictures (the Most Part Bawdy)”: The Anglo-Japanese Painting Trade in the Early 1600s’, *AB*, 2005, pp.50-72. This account contains some errors.

Reasons for acquisition

This section will discuss possible reasons for the acquisition of porcelain and will demonstrate that this was almost exclusively a courtly activity, well established at other European courts before its appearance in England towards the end of the sixteenth century. It is usually assumed that the purchase of porcelain was not initially simply for the material qualities of the objects, but that the introduction of chocolate, coffee and tea was the inspiration for the importation of large amounts of porcelain, as well as the manufacture of Delft in Holland and ultimately the successful manufacture of this mysterious and magical substance at Meissen from 1708. This view fails to take account of experiments in porcelain manufacture before those new hot drinks were known in the West. A type of imitation porcelain was produced in Venice from 1504 and artificial porcelain in Ferrara from c. 1561, but no examples of either of these types survives.⁶⁵ Greater success was achieved at the Medici “factory”, which began production in 1575; none of the surviving examples can be dated later than 1587, although there are documentary references up to 1620.⁶⁶ In both of the latter cases, the rulers were closely involved and this might be compared with their determination to open their own tapestry workshops during the same period, which enjoyed greater success, no doubt because the technology was better understood. Duke Francesco I de’ Medici (1541-1587) claimed personal involvement: ‘he has also found the manner of making Indian porcelain, and all his attempts are successful in that they are of the same quality of those of the Indies...’.⁶⁷ This was inaccurate, as Chinese porcelain is hard paste and therefore of superior quality and durability to the production at the Medici factory, which was of a soft-paste porcelain with a high glass content. Porcelain was believed by many to break on contact with poison and therefore to be particularly suitable for a ruler’s table. Fragmentary deposits datable to the thirteenth century have been excavated at Lucera, Italy.⁶⁸ In 1563, the Archbishop of Braga told Pope Pius IV that he should use porcelain instead of silver at dinner, thus setting a good example to other churchmen and, as an added inducement, the Archbishop asserted that the

⁶⁵ Distelberger, R. et al., *Western Decorative Arts, Part I: Medieval, Renaissance, and Historicizing Styles including Metalwork, Enamels, and Ceramics*, The Collections of the National Gallery of Art Washington Systematic Catalogue, 1993, p.234.

⁶⁶ *ibid.*, p. 235.

⁶⁷ Report by the Venetian Ambassador in 1576 quoted in Massinelli, A.M. and Tuena, F., *Treasures of the Medici*, 1992, p.63.

⁶⁸ Whitehouse, D., ‘Chinese Porcelain in Medieval Europe’, *Medieval Archaeology*, 16 (1972), p.63-78.

beauty of blue and white was greater than sapphire and alabaster.⁶⁹ It must have been its rarity, rather than notions of financial value, which inspired the earliest collectors, although according to Ulisse Aldovrandi writing in 1648, food tasted better served in ceramic vessels.⁷⁰

The status of porcelain

Porcelain's rarity and alleged ability to detect poison made it a particularly suitable diplomatic gift and all the earliest recorded examples in Western Europe belonged only to persons of high social rank. That porcelain acquired status soon after its earliest known appearance in the West can be demonstrated by such pieces as the Yuan Dynasty "Gaignières-Fonthill" Vase (c. 1320-40) [National Museum of Ireland], which formerly bore silver and enamel mounts dateable to 1381 (removed in the mid-nineteenth century) and the late fourteenth/early fifteenth century celadon "Katzenelnbogen" Bowl [Hessisches Landesmuseum, Kassel], which was probably purchased on pilgrimage in the Holy Land in the 1430s and which has mounts of the mid-fifteenth century, bearing the owner's coat of arms.⁷¹ There are references to a few pieces of porcelain, both mounted and unmounted, in French royal inventories of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century.⁷² The antiquarian and traveller Ciriaco of Ancona gave two porcelain ewers to Pope Eugenius IV in 1431.⁷³ Pieces of porcelain appear in numerous Italian paintings from the fifteenth century onwards, one of the earliest examples being a *Virgin and Child* c. 1460 by Francesco Benaglio [NGA, Washington].⁷⁴ A drawing by Ercole Setti (1530-1617) inscribed *La porcellana*, apparently showing porcelain vendors in the street has been dated to c. 1558-9.⁷⁵ There are also pieces mentioned in royal wills, for example, that of Maria, Queen of Naples-Sicily in 1323, and donated to institutions, such as the celadon bowl with

⁶⁹ Boxer, C.R., 'The Dutch East India Company and the China Trade', *History Today*, XXXIX, November, 1979, pp.741-50.

⁷⁰ Quoted in *Pots & Pans: a Colloquium on Precious Metals and Ceramics in the Muslim, Chinese and Graeco-Roman Worlds*, ed. M. Vickers, Oxford, 1985, p.125.

⁷¹ Ayers, J. 'Early Ming Taste in Porcelain', *Victoria and Albert Museum Bulletin*, II, 1966, p.21-35. *Porcelain for Palaces*, p.15. *Circa 1492: Art in the Age of Exploration*, exh. cat, Washington 1991-2, Levenson, J.A., ed., cat. no. 16; *Encounters: the meeting of Asia and Europe 1500-1800*, eds. A. Jackson and A. Jaffer, 2004, pp.46-7.

⁷² Lightbown, R., *Secular Goldsmiths' Work in Medieval France: A History*, 1978, p.33.

⁷³ Ayers, J. ed., *Chinese Ceramics in the Topkapi Saray Museum Istanbul: a complete catalogue*, 3v., 1980, I, p.29, n.19.

⁷⁴ Spriggs, A.I., 'Oriental Porcelain in Western Paintings 1450-1700', *TOCS*, 36, 1967, pp.73-87.

⁷⁵ On the market in 2002 – Crispian Riley-Smith, Master Drawings catalogue no. 1.

European mounts given by Archbishop Warham to New College, Oxford in 1516.⁷⁶ Numerous examples featured as diplomatic gifts from the Sultan of Cairo, recorded examples dating from 1442 to Doge Foscari and in 1447 to Charles VII of France.⁷⁷

Routes of transmission

Whatever doubts have recently been expressed about whether Marco Polo actually went to China, he described porcelain and indeed used the word *porcellana*. It seems most likely that the route by which Far Eastern objects initially came to Western Europe was via the Near East; the well-known collection now in the Topkapi-Saray, Istanbul, contains outstanding examples of early porcelains and the earliest reference to their use in Turkey dates from 1331.⁷⁸ Archaeological evidence demonstrates that porcelain was sent on the potentially hazardous overland caravan routes from China to that area.⁷⁹ Chinese porcelain was also traded through India from at least the tenth century and the presence of Chinese ships in the ports of the Malabar coast was noted by most travellers, which may in part account for references to 'Indian' porcelain.⁸⁰ These references pre-date the arrival of the Portuguese and their seizure of control of inter-country trade. It should be noted that Hindus rejected porcelain for eating and drinking. However, the Mogul Emperor Jahangir was reported 'in a great rage' to have ordered a severe beating for a senior official when 'a faire China dish...was broken by some mischance'.⁸¹

Porcelain came to Europe in the form of diplomatic gifts from Egypt. There were 20 pieces in a presentation to Doge Pasquale Malipiero from the Sultan of Egypt in 1461.⁸² In 1492 the inventory taken on the death of Lorenzo de' Medici lists more than 50 pieces of porcelain and he had received porcelain as a diplomatic gift when an embassy arrived from

⁷⁶ Krisztinkovics, B. and Korach, M. 'Un antico documento sulla porcellana cinese in Europa', *Faenza*, 53 (1967), p.27-30; Marks, R. and Williamson, P., eds., *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, exh. cat. V&A, 2003, no. 188.

⁷⁷ Belevitch-Stankevitch, H., *Le gout chinois en France au temps de Louis XIV*, Paris, 1910, p.xxi; Mack, R.E., *Bazaar to Piazza: Islamic Trade & Italian Art 1300-1600*, 2002.

⁷⁸ Ayers, *Topkapi*, p.5.

⁷⁹ Lecture by Professor John Carswell, The International Ceramics Fair and Seminar, 11/6/03.

⁸⁰ Gray, B., 'The export of Chinese porcelain to India', *TOCS*, xxxvi, 1964-6, p.21-37 and Hardie, P. 'China's Ceramic Trade with India', *TOCS*, 48, 1983-4, pp.15-31.

⁸¹ *Early Travels*, p. 109.

⁸² Ströber, E., 'The Earliest Documented Ming Porcelain in Europe: A Gift of Chinese Porcelain from Ferdinando de' Medici (1549-1609) to the Dresden Court', *ICF&S Yearbook 2004*, pp.26-35 (the footnotes, printed incorrectly, were subsequently provided by the organisers).

Sultan Qaitbay in Cairo in 1487.⁸³ The Portuguese were the first to establish direct trading contacts with the Far East by sea and became an important conduit for the westward transmission of Oriental goods; they began to import Chinese export porcelain (mainly of Wan-Li period 1573-1619) systematically from the middle of the sixteenth century, especially after their acquisition of Macao in 1554.⁸⁴ The Portuguese factor in Antwerp gave Durer three pieces of porcelain during the artist's visit to that city in 1520-1.⁸⁵ The porcelain used for the 1565 wedding in Lisbon of Alessandro Farnese and Dona Maria of Portugal was 'esteemed more highly than gold or silver'.⁸⁶ Filippo Sassetti writing from Lisbon in October 1578, where there were six specialist shops selling porcelain in the Rua Nova dos Mercadores, recorded the importation of 200 casks of porcelain, which sold immediately.⁸⁷ Spanish galleons crossing the Pacific from Manila to Central America clearly also played a part; in 1572 Henry Hawks reported that Spanish 'ships which goe to the Islands of China...have brought from thence...dishes of earth, and cups of the same, so fine that every man that may have a peece of them, will give the weight of silver for it'.⁸⁸ The Emperor Charles V owned few examples of porcelain, according to the inventory of 1561.⁸⁹ However, 'the first great Western collector of...rare and precious objects from the orient' was Catharine of Austria, wife of João III of Portugal.⁹⁰ Some of these may have been appropriated by her nephew, Philip II.⁹¹ By the time of his death in 1598, Philip II owned more than 3,000 pieces of porcelain of all shapes and sizes, some of which were coloured and gilded and some were mounted.⁹² In this context, it is worth noting that in 1573 two galleons which sailed from Manila to Acapulco were recorded as carrying more than 22,000 pieces of porcelain and that the cargo of the *San Diego* which, having left

⁸³ *Libro d'Inventario dei Beni di Lorenzo il Magnifico*, eds. Spallanzani, M. and Bertela, G.G., Florence 1992, p.14-15. Mack, p. 188, n. 72.

⁸⁴ Impey, O., *Chinoiserie: The Impact of Oriental Styles on Western Art and Decoration*, New York, 1977, p.45, 90.

⁸⁵ *Circa 1492*, p.115.

⁸⁶ Lowe, K.J.P. ed., *Cultural Links Between Portugal and Italy in the Renaissance*, Oxford, 2000, p.53.

⁸⁷ Impey, *Chinoiserie*, p.90. Lightbown, R.W., 'Oriental Art and the Orient in Late Renaissance and Baroque Italy', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 32, 1969, p.228-279. Sassetti, a Florentine resident first in Lisbon and then India, wrote numerous letters to the Medici Grand Dukes and others; see below.

⁸⁸ 'The Original Writings & Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts', ed. E.G.R. Taylor, I, *Hakluyt Society*, 1935, p.109.

⁸⁹ Trnek, H., 'Exotica in the Kunstkammern of the Hapsburgs: Their Inventories and Collections' in *Exotica: The Portuguese Discoveries and the Renaissance Kunstkammer*, exh. cat., Lisbon, 2001, (hereafter "Exotica") pp.39-67, 33.

⁹⁰ Vassallo e Silva, N., 'Precious Objects and Marvels: the Goa-Lisbon Trade' in *Exotica* op. cit., pp.27-37.

⁹¹ Gschwend, A.J., 'The Marvels of the East: Renaissance Curiosity Collections in Portugal', in *The Heritage of Rauluchantim*, exh. cat., Lisbon, 1996, pp.83-127.

⁹² Shulsky, L.R., 'Philip II of Spain as Porcelain Collector', *Oriental Art*, 44, 1998, pp.51-4. Shulsky, L.R. 'Chinese Porcelain in Spanish Colonial Sites in the Southern Part of North America and the Caribbean', *TOCS*, 63, 1998-9, pp. 83-98.

Manila, sank in December 1600, included more than 1200 pieces of porcelain.⁹³ The 1605 inventory of the Duke of Lerma's palace in Madrid included 430 pieces of Chinese porcelain, some of it polychrome.⁹⁴ Philip II also owned numerous lacquer objects.⁹⁵ When he received a gift from the Jesuits in Japan in 1584 his recorded comments indicate that he was one of the few who could distinguish between Chinese and Japanese lacquer.⁹⁶ Objects of this type were frequently exchanged amongst members of the extended Hapsburg family as gifts, such as the three chests of porcelain and Indian bedhangings sent to Madrid by the Archduchess Isabella Clara Eugenia in 1609, while Philip III in 1599 gave many curiosities to his new mother-in-law, the Archduchess Maria, who was expanding the *kunstkammer* in Graz [does not survive].⁹⁷

Porcelain made in China during the Ming Dynasty (1368-1644) is that most commonly found in Europe during the period under discussion. Amongst the earliest documented pieces in Europe were those sent from Florence, where it had already appeared in an inventory of 1579, to Dresden in February, 1590 as a diplomatic gift from Grand Duke Ferdinando to the Elector Christian I. Of the 16 pieces recorded at that time in the *kunstkammer*, eight survive in the Green Vaults today, of which at least two appear in the Medici 1579 inventory. The Medici inventories make reference to 'porcellana...venuto de l'India'. Amongst these items were two pieces of the highly-prized *kinrande* porcelain.⁹⁸ The porcelain objects were then displayed in a specially made box of 'Indian lacquer', which was a gift from the Duke of Weimar in 1616.⁹⁹ Francesco Carletti writing from Macao in 1598 describes the porcelain available there and which type of decoration was particularly favoured by customers from the Grand Mogul downwards, but 'the commonest and most saleable, and that esteemed the most beautiful is that which is ordinarily seen' i.e. blue and white.¹⁰⁰ By 1619 there were a number of specialists producing imitation Chinese porcelain in Lisbon.¹⁰¹ However, as these were decorated 'with Chinese decorations in faience-techniques', it seems unlikely they would have deceived a serious

⁹³ Shulsky 1998 op. cit. *Le San Diego: un trésor sous la mer* exh. cat. Paris, 1994, eds. D. Carré, J-P. Desroches et F. Goddio, p.311.

⁹⁴ Schroth, S.W., 'The Duke of Lerma's Palace in Madrid: a reconstruction of the original setting for Cristoforo Stati's *Samson and the Lion*', *Apollo*, 154, August, 2001, pp.11-21.

⁹⁵ Trnek op. cit., p.58.

⁹⁶ Impey and Jörg, op. cit., p. 285.

⁹⁷ Trnek, op. cit., p.58,61.

⁹⁸ Ströber, op. cit., p.27.

⁹⁹ Ströber, op. cit., pp.31-32.

¹⁰⁰ Lightbown, 1969 op. cit., p.240.

¹⁰¹ Baart, J.M., 'Ceramic Consumption and Supply in Early Modern Amsterdam: Local Production and Long-distance Trade' in *Work in Towns 850-1850*, Corfield, P.J. and Keene, D., eds., Leicester 1990, p.74-85.

collector. The Dutch held auctions of the contents of the captured Portuguese carracks *San Jago* in 1602 and *Catharina* in Amsterdam in 1604, which included 100,000 pieces of porcelain and at which James I and Henri IV were purchasers.¹⁰² The Dutch commenced direct importation from China in 1610.¹⁰³

English Royal inventories

The inventories taken after Henry VIII's death in 1547 reveals that he possessed four pieces of porcelain, three of which were mounted in silver-gilt, two being also set with jewels, while the fourth was awaiting mounting.¹⁰⁴ Chinese porcelain with jewelled mounts dateable to the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries survives in the Topkapi collections (many of the mounts are much later).¹⁰⁵ These objects are not listed in the 1542 inventory of Whitehall, but there was a substantial increase in ceramic objects by the time of the 1547 inventory.¹⁰⁶ It seems probable that Henry received these as gifts, but the substantial allocation of 40 oz. of gold to the mounting of the fourth piece implies that the King valued them. The colours of the first three are not specified but the fourth is described as 'Turkey collar' i.e. turquoise. In the fifteenth century turquoise and copper-red are noted amongst the 'fine monochrome glazes' being used.¹⁰⁷ However, mounting them also suggests that they were considered as curiosities, equivalent to the many coconuts, shells and ostrich eggs which were accorded the same treatment; one porcelain cup belonging to Henry had a cover 'with four conyes heddes'. The first cup is described as 'glasse fasshion with twoo handelles' and it may be its shape, rather than appearance, which prompted this description, while the last is called 'a stone called pur-selyne' (see further discussion of terminology below). Henry also owned a mounted ostrich egg.

At other European courts at this time, notable collectors including the French king, owned similar objects. François I acquired two vases mounted in silver-gilt in 1532; by 1561 an inventory of the French royal collection records six pieces, including only one of those acquired in 1532.¹⁰⁸ The source of these objects is not known. Henry VIII and François I therefore owned about the same relatively small number but in contrast, the 1553 inventory

¹⁰² Volker, T., *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company*, Leyden, 1954, p.22.

¹⁰³ Impey, *Chinoiserie*, p.46.

¹⁰⁴ Starkey, D., ed., *The Inventory of King Henry VIII: The Transcript*, v.I, 1998, p. 27, nos. 611 one cuppe, 1579 one layer, 1597 one layer; p.98, no. 3674 a blewe Cuppe.

¹⁰⁵ *Süleyman the Magnificent*, nos. 74-7.

¹⁰⁶ Hayward, M.A. *The 1542 Inventory of Whitehall: Volume I, Commentary*, London, 2004, p.117.

¹⁰⁷ Watson, W. *The Arts of China 900-1620*, 2000, p. 234.

¹⁰⁸ Castelluccio, S., *Les Collections royales d'objets d'art de François I^{er} à la Révolution*, Paris, 2002, p.21.

of Duke Cosimo de' Medici reveals 373 pieces of porcelain, few of them mounted, and many of the references indicate the use of descriptive terms already in use for objects made of other materials, e.g. 'after the fashion of coolers'.¹⁰⁹ There were another 432 pieces in Villa Medici, Rome.¹¹⁰ Some of these were presumably amongst those sent from Cairo as diplomatic gifts to Lorenzo the Magnificent referred to above.

No detailed inventory of household goods survives for Elizabeth I, so we cannot obtain the same sort of information in this case. Other records reveal that she received several New Year's gifts of clothing whose descriptions refer to China, such as, 'one french gowne of russet stitched cloth...[with] hanging sleeves lyned with white Taphata embrodered with Antiques of golde and silke of sondrie colours called China worke'.¹¹¹ Elizabeth was also given gifts of porcelain on a number of occasions and a cup with English mounts datable to c. 1565, now in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, corresponds to the description of one given to her in 1582.¹¹² Hallmarked English mounts on surviving pieces of porcelain are especially important in allowing us to establish a *terminus post quem* for the arrival of the porcelain objects in this country.

The still-unidentified 'M^r Lychfelde' gave 'one Cup of Purseline thonesyde paynted Red the foute and Cover sylver guilt...and a rynge lyke a Snake on the toppe of the Couer' [the latter comment a slightly later addition], as well as 'a red Gallie Cup the Couer and foote of siluer guilt' at an unknown date, the first of which might be a piece of *kinrande* (characteristically decorated on the exterior only), but the second was only earthenware.¹¹³ Like most of those mentioned above, it is not blue and white, as might be expected, nor was the gift to her from Lord Burghley of 'one Porrynger of white Purselyn garnisshid with golde, the Cover of golde with A Lyon one the Toppe thereof...Geven by the Lord Threasorer 1587', which may have been a New Year's gift at the end of the year.¹¹⁴ Burghley's second son offered the Queen at an unknown date in 1588 'one Cup of Grenne

¹⁰⁹ Lightbown, 1969 op. cit., p. 232.

¹¹⁰ *Villa Medici: il Sogno di un cardinale, collezioni e artisti di Ferdinando de' Medici*, exh. cat. Rome, 1999, p. 214.

¹¹¹ *Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe Unlock'd: The Inventories of the Wardrobe of Robes prepared in July 1600*, ed. J. Arnold, Leeds, 1988, p. 270, no. 96. 6 further such references: p. 286, no. 97; p. 305, no. 125; p. 320, no. 7; p. 323, nos. 20, 21, 22 [incorrectly listed in the index].

¹¹² Illustrated in the *Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, Winter, 2003, p. 7.

¹¹³ Collins, A.J., *Jewels and Plate of Elizabeth I*, 1955, p. 592, no. 1582 and p. 566, no. 1487

¹¹⁴ *ibid.* p. 590, no. 1577.

Pursselyne the Foute Shanke and Cover Sylver gylte...geven by Mr Robert Cecill'.¹¹⁵ This was one of four similar items sent to the Mint in October, 1600, (some of which were purchased by the officials there), which also included 'oone Cup of Purslaine glasse fation with two handles garnisshid with silver and guilt...', of which the description is so close that it must be an object inherited from her father (see above).¹¹⁶ Another item disposed of at that time was 'oone Jugge being white the foote and couer of siluer and guilt', which as Collins noted, could be a piece of porcelain.¹¹⁷ Elizabeth owned 'oone Almaine Cup with a Couer guilte having thre purselaine heddes', which is a puzzling reference; while the cup is probably a stoneware, the "purselaine" heads on the cover are mysterious, although one was also attached to a 'lie potte of siluer and guilt' which was fitted with a 'combecase'.¹¹⁸ The differences between porcelain and lesser types of ceramic are recognised by such entries as 'oone Earthen Cruse garnished with siluer' (which seems to have been broken by 1594), in contrast to 'oone faire Laire of Purslaine garnishid with siluer and guilt being a Griffens hed' or 'oone Laire of Purslaine garnisshid with siluer and gilt' which was also set with jewels.¹¹⁹

Members of the Cecil family were amongst the first English courtiers to own numerous pieces of porcelain (see pp.32-38). Robert Cecil's important position at court meant that he was the recipient of a letter from Henri IV in 1602 which refers to 'varieties and novelties from India and China, sent for the King's own use'.¹²⁰ Perhaps this was the source of the references in Anne of Denmark's inventories. These reveal that at Oatlands in 1616 she had: 'A China table of tenne squares, standing on a pillar wth 3 feet A Cabinet on it of chyna worke wth an other cabinet on y^e topp and wth in an inclosure of glasse, a worke of y^e actons of o^r Savio^r to his crucifixon & assenton made in wax'.¹²¹ In 1617 there was also 'A fayre embrothered carpett of chyna worke in gold and coulored silkes lyned wth changeable chyna silke in y^e booke chamber' and 'In y^e next with drawing chamber a China gilt table'.¹²² At Denmark House, the Queen had 'In y^e wardrobe of bedds...the timber of a guilt couch of china worcke the head guilte', while 'In the roome beyond the little

¹¹⁵ *ibid.* p.591, no.1580.

¹¹⁶ *ibid.* p.349, no.347.

¹¹⁷ *ibid.* p.445, no.893.

¹¹⁸ *ibid.*, p.346, no. 332; p. 536, no. 1363.

¹¹⁹ *ibid.* p.448, no. 907; p.487, no. 1080; p.491, no. 1099.

¹²⁰ *CSPC East Indies, 1513-1616*, ed. W.N. Sainsbury, 1862, p. 135.

¹²¹ 'An inventory of her Ma^{ties} stuffe in Otelandes taken at her Mat^{ties} remove in October 1616', East Sussex Record Office GLY 315; this item reappears with a slightly different description in the 1617 inventory.

¹²² 'An inventory of her Ma^{ts} owne stuffe in Oatlands taken y^e day after her remove from thence being the 7th of October 1617', East Sussex Record Office GLY 319.

Beddchamber' there were 'Eight peces of purcelane garnished with silver guilte in a Cabonett of Crimsen Velvett' and 'A Chyna Carpett of Carnacon Velvett'.¹²³ The porcelain could have come as a diplomatic gift, although her brother Christian IV, King of Denmark, owned some pieces, a few of which survive at Rosenborg Castle, Copenhagen.

Courtiers and their collections

Other than the monarch, those courtiers with extensive European connections, mainly diplomatic in nature, might be expected to share a taste for the exotic and to be the recipients of diplomatic gifts. Some of them had travelled abroad on a regular basis, a number in order to attend a foreign university (usually Italian), others on diplomatic mission or as warriors, especially to the Netherlands in the late sixteenth century. However, of those senior Elizabethan courtiers for whom inventories survive, those of Robert, Earl of Leicester do not appear to contain any references to Oriental pieces in his collections.¹²⁴ Lord Lumley's inventory of 1590 is exceptional in the amount of detail it provides and like Leicester's does mention artists' names, even if some attributions are rather optimistic.¹²⁵ His wide-ranging collection is also the largest known from this period, containing 300 paintings, and several pietra dura tables, but also 'two large tables of China woork', which could be references to imported lacquer or imitation lacquer.¹²⁶

Five pieces of blue and white Wan Li porcelain with 'contemporary English silver-gilt mounts' (by an unknown silversmith active c. 1585) were acquired by the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 1944, of which four had been sold from Burghley House in 1888.¹²⁷ For this reason, these pieces have traditionally been associated with Lord Burghley, however, in the absence of any inventory of his possessions this cannot be substantiated. As no other objects appear to survive at Burghley which can be directly connected with him, these may have entered the collection at a later date. There was a fashion for acquiring such objects

¹²³ Payne, M.T.W., 'An inventory of Queen Anne of Denmark's 'ornaments, furniture, householde stuffe, and other parcells' at Denmark House, 1619', *JoHoC*, 13, no. 1 (2001), pp.35,41.

¹²⁴ Goldring, E., 'The Earl of Leicester's Inventory of Kenilworth Castle c. 1578', *English Heritage Historical Review*, II, 2007, pp.37-59; Bracken, S., 'Robert Cecil as Art Collector' in *Patronage, Culture and Power: The Early Cecils 1558-1612*, ed. P. Croft, 2002, pp.121-137 ("2002a").

¹²⁵ Lumley, op. cit.

¹²⁶ Howard, M. and S. Bracken 'Lumley Castle and its Inventories' in Lumley, op. cit., pp.29-33, 32.

¹²⁷ Avery, Louise, 'Chinese Porcelain in English Mounts', *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, n.s. 2, 1943-44, p.266-272.

in the mid-nineteenth century in order to re-establish the historic connections of certain collections, as noted by Philippa Glanville.¹²⁸

Another well-known mounted piece of Wan Li is the “Trenchard” Bowl in the V&A (ill. 1), traditionally said to have been given to the family by Philip the Fair and Juana the Mad during their enforced visit to England in 1506. The porcelain itself was not made before 1522 and the mounts are datable to 1599-1600 rendering the traditional connection inaccurate.¹²⁹ Puzzlingly, the other bowl of the pair is unmounted.¹³⁰

In a will signed on 10 July 1597 Walter Raleigh bequeathed to his son Walter a ‘chyna bed of silke ymbrodered with silke and china gould, with the bedsted guilte...[and] one suite of porcelane sett in silver and gylt, that ys to saye, two basons and eweres with twoe flaggons and two boles sutable’, but in the event that Walter died without heirs ‘then my good frinde Sir Roberte Cecill shall have the said whole suite of porcelane’.¹³¹ Cecil predeceased Raleigh by six years. This will was never proved and was only rediscovered in 1971 and clearly none of the bequests were carried out. It is possible that this was booty from a captured ship, such as the cargo of the *Madre de Dios* captured off the Azores in the summer of 1592, the list of whose contents included numerous fabrics, carpets and ‘*porcellan vessels of China...ebenwood as black as jet, bedsteds of the same*’.¹³² In 1601 Raleigh wrote to his nephew ‘You must remember my wife for purselane and mee with pied silks for curtens if you meane to bribe mee’.¹³³ He refers to this ‘porselayne’ again in a letter to Gilbert of 11 November (no. 152).

Elizabeth, Countess of Shrewsbury, (“Bess of Hardwick”) was the builder of two houses at Hardwick, where a remarkable number of textiles survive. Although it has been stated that nothing in the 1601 Hardwick inventory is described as Chinese, in fact at Hardwick Old Hall there was a ‘Counterpoynt of China cloth of golde...’; however, this object was not in use, possibly because it does not appear to have had bed curtains, a bedhead or a valance to match.¹³⁴ At Hardwick New Hall there was a window cushion ‘lyned with China Cloth of

¹²⁸ Glanville, P., *Silver in Tudor and Early Stuart England*, 1990, p. 347.

¹²⁹ Glanville, op. cit., cat. 74.

¹³⁰ It remains in a private collection.

¹³¹ *The Letters of Sir Walter Raleigh*, eds. A. Latham and J. Youings, Exeter, 1999, p.383.

¹³² Bracken, 2001, p.10. Impey, *Chinoiserie*, p.37, quoting Richard Hakluyt.

¹³³ *Letters* no. 151, 31 October 1601 to Sir John Gilbert.

¹³⁴ Impey *Eastern Trade. Of household stuff: the 1601 inventories of Bess of Hardwick*, 2001, p. 33.

golde' in the Best Bedchamber and in the little Chamber within the best bed-chamber 'a quilt of india stuff imbrodered with beastes'.¹³⁵ According to Santina Levey, some textiles survive which may correspond to the inventories.¹³⁶ It is difficult to associate surviving examples with Bess rather than her son William Cavendish.¹³⁷ Such sets of matching hangings were referred to by Francesco Sassetti in 1586.¹³⁸ Irrespective of whether or not they are described as Chinese, matching sets of bed hangings are found in the majority of inventories studied.¹³⁹ At Hardwick New Hall, there was 'a pursland Cup with a cover trymmed with silver and guilt waying fourtene ounces' and 'an oystridge egg trymmed with silver and guilt with a Cover not wayed'.¹⁴⁰ The latter is included in the list of plate because its silver gilt mounts weighing 14oz. were considered more valuable than the porcelain itself.

Collections in early Seventeenth-century England

All the above-mentioned inventories list groups of objects belonging to a single owner, but in most cases, it is doubtful if we can really call them collectors in the modern sense of the word. Early collectors are typically considered to be those who owned a "Cabinet of Curiosities". This might most usefully be explained as a collection which attempted to encapsulate the known world through the possession of examples of *naturalia*, such as shells or coral (unicorns' horns were especially popular), and *artificialia* or manmade objects, including paintings and porcelain. This type of collector was interested in objects which represented both *artificialia* and *naturalia* simultaneously, such as mounted nautilus shells or coconut cups. A number of paintings illustrate such collections, for example, *Venus and Cupid in a Collector's Cabinet*, by Jan Brueghel the Younger, c. 1630/40 [Philadelphia Museum of Art] (ill. 2). Although the word cabinet could mean a piece of furniture, in this sense it can range from a single room to a succession of rooms and it is clear that this meaning was in common use; for example, in a description of Francis Carew's house at Beddington in 1610: 'in the house is to be seen a handsome cabinet, the walls of which are of branched work of wood gilded, enriched with beautiful pieces of

¹³⁵ *Houshold stuff* p.46.

¹³⁶ Levey S.M., *An Elizabethan Inheritance: The Hardwick Hall Textiles*, 1998, p. 29.

¹³⁷ Crill, R. 'Angels and Elephants', *Apollo*, 160, November, 2004, pp.87-91.

¹³⁸ Lightbown, 1969 op. cit., p.237.

¹³⁹ See Appendix I for a complete chronological list of all the English inventories consulted.

¹⁴⁰ *Houshold stuff* pp.59,61.

marble with the floor of the same'.¹⁴¹ Examples in Europe which survive at least in part are those of the Archduke Ferdinand II at Schloss Ambras and the Elector Christian I in Dresden, although the most remarkable was that formed by Rudolph II.¹⁴² The prime example recorded in England is that of Walter Cope, the close associate of Robert Cecil, but this collection survives only in the form of written descriptions.¹⁴³ It was said to be 'stuffed with queer foreign objects', including such tantalising items as a "flying rhinoceros", as well as various objects described as Indian and Chinese. There was some porcelain, carefully distinguished from 'earthen pitchers', as well as 'fine pictures' and 'all kinds of corals'.¹⁴⁴ He also owned a 'Madonna made of Indian feathers'; the 1609 inventory of Pompeo Leoni's collection in Madrid contained 'a feather picture from "India"',¹⁴⁵

In the text for Britain's Burse Jonson referred to 'Carpets wrought of Paraquitos feather[s], umbrellas made of the winge of the Indian Butterfly Ventolas of fliynge fishes finnes'.¹⁴⁶ Cope, who was the builder of Cope Castle (later Holland House), Kensington, was said by the traveller Thomas Platter to own 'fine pictures' and was noted later by Vertue as a collector of paintings by Holbein, although their subject matter was not specified.¹⁴⁷

Two Case Studies: Thomas Arundell and Robert Cecil

A remarkable collection containing an unusually large number of pieces of porcelain which has received little attention is that of Thomas Arundell, from May 1605 Lord Arundell of Wardour. The similarity of his name to that of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, the most well-known collector of the seventeenth century, has led to confusion and despite the anachronism he will only be referred to here as Wardour.¹⁴⁸ In order to provide some

¹⁴¹ Rye, W.B. *England as Seen by Foreigners*, London, 1865, p.62.

¹⁴² Schloss Ambras inventory 30/5/1596, Garner, Sir H., *Chinese Export Art in Schloss Ambras*, 1975 ; the first Dresden inventory is that of 1587: Watanabe-O'Kelly, *Court Culture in Dresden from Renaissance to Baroque*, Basingstoke, 2002, 74. Fucikova, E. ed., *Rudolf II and Prague: The Court and the City*, 1997.

¹⁴³ *Thomas Platter's Travels in England 1599*, trans. C. Williams, 1973, pp.171-3; Hakluyt, ed. Taylor, v.2, doc. 66, p.408; 'The Diary of the journey of Philip Julius, Duke of Stettin Pomerania through England in the Year 1602', ed. Dr. G. von Bulow, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, n.s. VI, 1892, pp.1-67.

¹⁴⁴ Platter, op.cit.

¹⁴⁵ Helmstutler Di Dio, K., 'The chief and perhaps only antiquarian in Spain: Pompeo Leoni and his collection in Madrid', *JoHoC*, 2006, pp.137-167 and online appendices [unpaginated], p.141.

¹⁴⁶ A "Saint Teresa at her Writing Table" made of feathers and gold mosaic, and said to be Mexican 16th century was advertised on p. XIII, *BM*, May, 2008. Knowles, op. cit., p.136.

¹⁴⁷ Croft, p.134, n. 13.

¹⁴⁸ What follows derives in part from GEC[okayne], *The Complete Peerage*, v.I, 1910, pp.263-4, but also from very close scrutiny of other sources, such as the Calendars of State Papers.

clarification, a brief outline of his activities and their probable influence on his collecting will be provided here. Wardour was born in either 1559 or 1560, died in 1639 and was a committed Catholic. He first travelled abroad in 1579, with a letter of recommendation from Elizabeth I to whom he was distantly related, to the Emperor Rudolf II. By May 1580 a letter from Rudolf recommends him warmly to the Gonzaga, so presumably he had the opportunity to view another major European collection on this visit.¹⁴⁹ This has mistakenly led to this reference being assigned to the Earl of Arundel, who was not born until 1585. Rudolf was a true collector, obsessed by the notion of possession and his enormous collection comprised thousands of objects, including 125 pieces of porcelain.¹⁵⁰ Rudolf's collections were systematically organised and access was usually quite limited, but it is possible that Wardour was so favoured. He was back in Rudolf's service in the 1590s, showing great bravery in capturing the enemy's standard at the battle of Gran (Esztergom) 3 September 1595, for which Rudolph rewarded him and his heirs in perpetuity with the title of Count Imperial on 14 December, 1595. This outraged Elizabeth I, although as much of the ensuing argument revolved around questions of precedence, it is probable that some of her senior courtiers were the ones who really felt threatened. Rudolf was sufficiently interested in the problem to write to Elizabeth to assure her of Wardour's worth and his own regard for him, and so it is possible that Wardour might have been one of the favoured entrants to the imperial collection. In 1599 'the imperiall Cownt Arundell' was rumoured to be moving into the 'litle Howse, ioyning to the Lord Burghleys' recently vacated by Sir Robert Cecil.¹⁵¹

Wardour has been associated with an unfinished miniature in the V&A which bears an inscription which translates as 'May 13th, 1596, in Venice, made by Isaac Oliver'.¹⁵² It also bears a puzzling later inscription in different ink which states that this is the true image of Arundell Talbot Equitis Aurati. In the row about Wardour's Imperial title, the term *eques auratus* was used in the correspondence which dealt with this, but the addition of the name Talbot cannot be explained at present, as these two families did not intermarry until the early nineteenth century. Wardour was in England in both April and July 1596 and in deep disgrace, so it seems unlikely that he could also have been in Venice in May that year.

¹⁴⁹ Luzio, A., *La Galleria del Gonzaga Venduta all'Inghilterra nel 1627-28*, Milan, 1913, p. 66.

¹⁵⁰ Fucikova, p.506.

¹⁵¹ Rowland Whyte to Sir Robert Sydney from Baynards Castell, 12 January 1599, A. Collins, *Letters and Memorials of State...*, 2v., 1746, p.158.

¹⁵² Illustrated as cat. no. 79 in *Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630*, exh. cat. Tate 1995. ed. Hearn, K., where the connection with Wardour is not discussed.

A portrait recorded at Wardour Castle in 1936 [untraced] is said to be of Wardour and was ascribed by his descendants to Van Dyck, although this attribution seems unlikely on the basis of a poor photograph in the Witt Library. In 1936 it was recorded with the initials HS or HSL on the back.¹⁵³ It seems likely to be by one of the Netherlandish artists working in London around 1620.¹⁵⁴

In late August 1605 Wardour left England secretly to take command of a force of about 1500 soldiers committed to support the Archdukes in the Low Countries. On the 10th August an inventory (Appendix II) was compiled of his possessions, presumably occasioned by the possibility that he might be killed in battle. In this document the paintings remain mostly unidentified as was common in England at this time. In the Gallery were displayed assorted foreign weapons, including ‘an Indyan weapon’, a ‘Coker nutt...and an oystridge Egge hanginge in the myddell’ [Appendix II, p.2]. An annotated copy of Sir John Harington’s *The Metamorphosis of Ajax* (1596) in the Folger Library may contain a reference to Wardour Castle: ‘a Castle...the wonder of the West...so furnished within, as China nor the West Indies scant allowes more plenty.’, although Wardour is nowhere referred to in the text by name.¹⁵⁵ This fulsome description does not fit easily with a subsequent reference to Wardour’s father Matthew having a ‘poore house’ with ‘as fine plate, and Porslin, as any as in the North’.¹⁵⁶ Matthew Arundell’s will of 1598 included a bequest to Elizabeth I of ‘a table carpet wrought in China’; this object is much more likely to come from the Near East, either Persia or Turkey. Wardour was quite exceptionally the owner of over 150 pieces of porcelain, which were stored in the “possylen house”. This is likely to have been a structure comparable to the numerous banqueting houses of various types constructed during this period. It may have been one of the subsidiary structures at Wardour Castle destroyed in the Civil War, whose footprint is now visible from above. In any case, this is the first known reference to a Porcelain House in England. Amongst the varied shapes were ‘one basen and Ewre of possylen wth a bulls head garnyshed, one greate possylen basen garnyshed’; others are described as

¹⁵³ Personal communication: Tabitha Barber.

¹⁵⁴ Blyenberch, van Somer or Mijtens, see *Dynasties* pp.202-230 for a discussion of the work of these Netherlandish artists in Jacobean London.

¹⁵⁵ STC12779; it is unclear whether the annotations are by Harington or by Lord Lumley who subsequently owned this copy.

¹⁵⁶ Personal communication: Mark Girouard. *Sir John Harington’s A New Discourse of a Stale Subject, called the Metamorphosis of Ajax*, a Critical Annotated Edition by E.S. Donno, 1962. pp.174-5. On p.18 Donno claims that the text is datable to before the Danvers murder of October 1594, which prompted their exile, although Wardour was only made an Imperial Count in December 1595 and is so described in the marginalia. Donno assumes that the annotations to the copy in the Folger Library are by Harington.

‘ungarnished’. Some of the objects were clearly in use: ‘fower sawcers and one Butter dyshe of possylen for my Ladies use’ [Appendix II, p.10]. There were also other dishes specified as “earth”, such as ‘twoe earthen bottles painted’, i.e. these are distinguished separately from the porcelain and there are other objects made of brass, marble and wood, as well as several pieces of glass made in Venice. As in Robert Cecil’s collection, there are objects described as wicker ‘Nyne wicker sawcers some painted and guylded wth a boxe’ (see below p.34). However, unlike Cecil’s inventory, there are no textiles described as “Chyna”. It has been pointed out that this mixture of objects can be directly compared with those in the Countess of Arundel’s ‘Pranketing House’ at Tart Hall, London, 35 years later and so Wardour seems to have been at the forefront of fashion.¹⁵⁷ Only the year before this inventory, the New Year’s entertainment at Court included ‘a magician of China’ and ‘China knights’.¹⁵⁸

Robert Cecil’s life and career do not require the same clarification; he will be referred to here as Salisbury (made 1st Earl in 1605) in order to distinguish him from other members of his immediate family. The unpublished inventory (Appendix III) taken shortly after his death of the contents of his London house, Salisbury House in the Strand, contains thirty nine references to Chyna, many of which encompass more than one object. This is not a probate inventory. Salisbury’s son, William Cecil, 2nd Earl of Salisbury seems to have had inventories of all his properties taken on a frequent basis. There are numerous references to textiles, as well as furniture (see below). Seventy seven pieces described as Chyna or purslin were kept in the Cabinet, which in this instance was a room containing a variety of unusual objects (Appendix III, p.21). The contents are listed by type of object, rather than room; they include a reference to the andirons for the ‘Cabennett’, which must therefore be a room with a fireplace, rather than a piece of furniture. In 1597 Elizabeth I was sent a ‘chandelier, façon d’Allemagne’ for her ‘cabinet’.¹⁵⁹ Another fifty mounted pieces are recorded in a list of plate which was sent to Cecil’s house at Theobalds in 1605.¹⁶⁰ Even after handing this property over to James I, Salisbury retained an apartment at Theobalds and in the absence of any documents it is not possible to ascertain whether these objects

¹⁵⁷ Personal communication from the late Richard Kilburn. For Tart Hall see Chew, E., ‘The Countess of Arundel and Tart Hall’ in *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, ed. E. Chaney, 2003, p.218, n.91 (hereafter *Evolution*) and Cust, L., ‘Notes on the Collections Formed by Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel and Surrey, K.G., II, *BM*, XX, 1911, pp. 97-100 and part III, XX, 1912, pp.233-236 and part IV, XX, 1912, pp.341-343.

¹⁵⁸ PRO SP14/6/21.

¹⁵⁹ Rye, W.B. *England as Seen by Foreigners*, London, 1865, lxxi.

¹⁶⁰ Hatfield House Archive: HHPB2.

remained at Theobalds or were sent up to London. As they were kept in the Cabinet, it can be assumed that these objects were not in daily use as tablewares and were therefore 'divested of [their] function', a prerequisite for the formation of a collection, according to Baudrillard.¹⁶¹

In the Salisbury House Cabinet, the 'ij litle round deepe Chyna dishes painted red & guilte' [Appendix III, p.21] are probably *kinrande*, comparable in decoration to the von Manderscheidt Cup in the Victoria & Albert Museum; these are very rare in European collections (the von Manderscheidt Cup: Chinese porcelain c. 1550-70, German mounts c. 1583). *Kinrande* is a Japanese word used for Chinese porcelain decorated with these brocade-like patterns; this was particularly prized in Japan.¹⁶² In Europe, *kinrande* 'seem hardly to have survived outside a few princely collections...'.¹⁶³ Some *kinrande* sherds datable to before 1600 have been found in Mexican excavations.¹⁶⁴ Occasionally, this decoration also appears with white, blue or green base colours.¹⁶⁵ The brocade-like patterns on the exteriors of this type of ceramic with extensive use of gilding, must have seemed quite exceptional to Europeans who would never otherwise have seen gilding on any ceramic object. Two examples of this type were included in the Medici gift to Dresden referred to above and are still in the collection there and there were several amongst the two hundred and thirty three pieces of porcelain at Schloss Ambras. The nearest European comparison would be pieces of sixteenth-century Italian maiolica with lustre decoration (which ultimately derives from Middle Eastern ceramics), but no references have so far been found to this type of object in an English collection. A separate list of plate begun in 1612, but incorporating some dated later entries, includes twenty seven mounted pieces and eighty five unmounted pieces.¹⁶⁶

Blue and white predominated in the Medici collection, but in Salisbury's inventories colours are seldom specified; polychrome enamels had been perfected in the reign of Chenghua (1464-1487), which offered the possibility of underglaze cobalt blue combined

¹⁶¹ Baudrillard, op. cit., p.7.

¹⁶² Lee, S.E., *A History of Far Eastern Art*, 5th edition, 1997, 474. Scott, R.E. and R. Kerr, *Ceramic Evolution in the Middle Ming Period: Hongzhi to Wanli (1488-1620)*, exh. cat. Percival David Foundation. V&A 1994-5.

¹⁶³ Ayers *Topkapi* p.20.

¹⁶⁴ Shulsky 1998-9.

¹⁶⁵ *Exotica* fig. 1 and cat. no. 92.

¹⁶⁶ HHPB2

with overglaze red, yellow, green and aubergine: this is later referred to as *Doucai*.¹⁶⁷ Then five colour enamels became the standard in the Jiajing (1521-66) and Wanli periods: this is referred to as *Wucai*.¹⁶⁸ The 'ij flatt round dishes of Chyna for fruite painted in div[er]s Cullors' might be of either of these types (Appendix III, p. 21). Salisbury's porcelain objects vary in size; both 'litle' and 'deepe' are referred to and terms such as 'voyder' are used, no doubt because whatever their actual function, their shape resembled a familiar object used for clearing the table. Thirty nine objects, in the Cabinet, are described as 'wicker', such as 'j greate deepe wicker Chyna Boule[,] iij flatt fruite dishes of wicker Chyna'. Wicker could signify an object such as the late Ming storage jar with its original woven cane framework and handles (base missing) in the Ashmolean Museum.¹⁶⁹ Another possibility is that it refers to something like the Wanli wine bowl with pierced trellis decoration on the sides now at Burghley, bequeathed by Anne, Countess of Exeter, granddaughter of Salisbury (see ill. 3).¹⁷⁰ A third possibility is the type of lacquer bowl with basketry panels in the collection at Schloss Ambras; a number of examples of this type dateable to the early seventeenth century survive.¹⁷¹ Cups and plates of "rush" appear in the 1589 inventory of Catherine de Medici, one of which was said to be 'in the style of Turkey', as well as 'one large basin of wicker, a medallion in the middle'.¹⁷²

In 1601 Sir John Gilbert wrote to Salisbury that he had 'taken a Brazil vessel, with porcelain and other wares. I wish you, being interested therein, to have your choice of all in the ship'; it is not clear whether or not this was intended to be a gift.¹⁷³ Although Salisbury's probity has often been questioned, some of his contemporaries were wary of offering gifts.¹⁷⁴ However, he was the recipient of gifts of porcelain on several occasions from 1602 onwards, variously described as porcelain or "cheney". For example, among 'Newe yeares gifts given to your Ho. this yeare 1603' are included 'from M^r Spilman One Boule of Cheney from S^r Walter Cope 1 Trove or Basen of Cheyney & a litle greene cupp'.

175

¹⁶⁷ Lee, 472.

¹⁶⁸ Lee, 473.

¹⁶⁹ Bracken, 2001, fig. 2.

¹⁷⁰ *The Wrestling Boys*, exh. cat., Burghley House, 1983, ed. G. Lang, no. 125, p.50.

¹⁷¹ Garner, 1975; Garner, Sir H. 'A Group of Chinese Lacquers with Basketry Panels', *Archives of Asian Art*, 20, 1966-7, pp.6-23.

¹⁷² Michahelles, K-R., 'Catherine de Medici's 1589 Inventory at the Hôtel de la Reine in Paris', *Furniture History*, XXXVIII, pp. 1-39, nos. 264, 360.

¹⁷³ Letter of 16 October 1601 from Plymouth, *CSPD* 1601-3, p.110.

¹⁷⁴ Bracken, 2003, p.208.

¹⁷⁵ HHPB68.

Salisbury's granddaughter Elizabeth, dowager Countess of Devonshire, bequeathed an exceptional collection of over 150 pieces of porcelain, some in pairs, to her daughter Anne, Countess of Exeter, in 1690 and it is possible that some of this may have originated in Salisbury's collection.¹⁷⁶ In 1606, the Spanish Ambassador Zuñiga reported that Cecil was 'very much pleased with some little things which I brought with me from Spain and the Indies'; it is probable the latter might have included Oriental objects.¹⁷⁷

Amongst the most senior courtiers, only Northampton is known to have owned numerous Oriental objects, the inventory taken on his death in 1614 referring to 'seven parcels of *Purslane* cuppes trimmed with silver and guilte, valued at xxii^{li}', a valuation which presumably relates to the silver-gilt mounts as, typically, these are in the lists of plate.¹⁷⁸ (See below in the section on furnishings and furniture).

References to porcelain in inventories outside court circles are extremely rare before 1614. A few have been traced in Devon and Cornwall, which may be because captured Spanish ships were brought to that area first. Thus, a [George Hoc]KEN of T[otnes?] in 1602/3 owned 'One Cheyney cuppe with a sylver foote' valued at 10s.¹⁷⁹

Objects other than Porcelain: Furnishings and Furniture

In 1602 the King of Achen [Sumatra] sent Elizabeth I a ring and 'two vestures woven and embroidered with gold and placed within a purple box of china'.¹⁸⁰ It is not clear what is meant by the latter. Salisbury's inventories also include numerous references to fabrics and furniture described as 'Chyna', mainly at Salisbury House, Strand. There are only seven references to 'Chyna' amongst the furnishings of Hatfield House in 1611. Hatfield House was exceptional in that certain rooms in the separate apartments intended for the King and Queen had two sets of furnishings divided between Extraordinary and Ordinary,

¹⁷⁶ A number of these are illustrated in *The Cecil Family Collects: Four Centuries of Decorative Arts from Burghley House*, Alexandria, Va. 1998, ed. O. Impey.

¹⁷⁷ Loomie, A.J., 'Sir Robert Cecil and the Spanish Embassy', in idem *Spain and the Early Stuarts 1585-1655*, 1996, pp. 30-57, 55.

¹⁷⁸ Shirley, E.P., 'An Inventory of the Effects of Henry Howard, K.G, Earl of Northampton, taken on his death in 1614', *Archaeologia*, 42, 1869, pp.347-378.

¹⁷⁹ *Devon Inventories of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, Devon & Cornwall Record Society, n.s. 11, Torquay, 1966, pp. 18-19.

¹⁸⁰ *CSPC East Indies* p.136.

presumably with the intention that the Extraordinary set would only be used on the occasion of a royal visit. Amongst the Extraordinary items in the Antechamber to the King's apartment was 'One greate gilte bedsteed' with hangings, valance, headcloth, counterpoint, one high chair, two high stools, two low stools, one footstool and two cushions 'of white taffata imbrothered all over with China silke and gould'.¹⁸¹ Amongst the items at Salisbury House in 1612 were 'One Sute of Chyna hanginges of Crimsen and watchett satten fynely painted and gilded Cont. 6. Peeces', 'j Cooch Bedsteed of mother of pearle' with 'j Counterpointe of white Chyna grograine imbrodred all over wth sleeves silke and gould in divers cullors belonginge to the Cooch', 'j skrine of imbrodred Chyna grograine sutable to the Counter Pointe', 'j highe Cha:[,] ij highe stooles[,ij] lowe stooles of whit Chyna Grograine imbrodred wth sleave silke' completed this ensemble.¹⁸² Five other 'Chyna Counterpoints' are listed as being 'not sutable to Bedds', meaning that they did not match the hangings of any then existing bed. There was also 'j Bedsteed of Chyna worke black and gilded' (i.e. its appearance was that of a Japanese lacquered object) (Appendix III, p.6). Impey notes that despite the inability of Europeans to distinguish accurately between these countries 'China gave its name to ceramics and Japan to lacquer'.¹⁸³ There was also 'j picture of the habitt of the Chynaes', presumably taken from an emblem book (Appendix III, p. 16).

References to beds may seem surprising, but there is also evidence from elsewhere in Europe at this time suggesting that the taste for these furnishings was shared by others of equal or higher status at other European courts. The Emperor Ferdinand I acquired a bedstead inlaid with mother-of-pearl in Nuremberg in 1547, which survived until the eighteenth century, while François I obtained a similar example from Portugal in 1529.¹⁸⁴ Sassetti, writing from Lisbon in 1578, mentioned that the Portuguese were importing beds from the Indies; while in India in 1585 he ordered Chinese bedhangings, although the junk sank. He was more successful in 1586, the hangings being accompanied by a bed frame of gilded wood.¹⁸⁵ The 1589 inventory of Catherine de Medici records 'one folding table in the style of India', while the inventory of Gabrielle d'Estrée in 1599 records 'un pavillon de taffetas de la Chine...'.¹⁸⁶ There are various references to 'all'Indiana' in the documents

¹⁸¹ Hatfield House Inventory of 1611 ("HH1611").

¹⁸² Appendix III, pp.2,7,8,11.

¹⁸³ Impey, *Lacquerwork*, p.125.

¹⁸⁴ Trnek, op. cit., p.33.

¹⁸⁵ Lightbown, 1969 op. cit. 235, 237.

¹⁸⁶ Impey, *Chinoiserie*, p.105; Belevitch-Stankevitich, p. xxxiii.

concerning Villa Medici, Rome, from the 1580s on, including beds, tables and a studiolo, and it was stated in 1615/16 that they were so called because of the type of ornament: ‘con lavori d’uccellami, fiori, rabeschi e cose come dicono all’Indiana...’.¹⁸⁷ This does not immediately sound unusual, but it might be compared with the table illustrated by Clifford-Smith in 1916, which was probably made in Europe after Chinese designs, although the statement that ‘lacquerwork copied from the oriental patterns which were imported...made its first appearance...towards the middle of the 17th century’ is no longer tenable.¹⁸⁸

Decoration of this type can be seen on the Namban lacquer coffer (see illustration 4) given by the Empress Maria of Austria to the convent of the Descalzas Reales in Madrid may have been given as early as 1582, but certainly by 1616 at the latest.¹⁸⁹ A casket which is probably japanned, rather than genuine lacquer, is visible in the painting in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, *The Allegory of Vanity*, 1627 (ill.5) by Paulus Moreelse.¹⁹⁰ In 1610 the first shipment of lacquered objects arrived in the Netherlands on board *de Roode Leeuw met de Piljen*, consisting of nine chests, of which the exact contents are unknown.¹⁹¹ The VOC then seems to have followed the advice of their local representative and placed special orders for limited quantities of lacquer, of which numerous examples were used as diplomatic gifts.¹⁹²

By 1612, Salisbury also owned ‘j Table of mother of Pearle¹⁹³, j fouldinge Table of Chyna black and gilded wth a frame...j square Chyna Table black and gilded wth a Pellican on it...j other Chyna Table wth a frame black & gilded’, and ‘j litle side Chyna Table standing uppon a pillar frame wth drawinge boxes’.¹⁹⁴ Amongst the cabinets were ‘j Cabennett or litle Chest of Chyna worke black and gilde...j Cabbennett of Chyna gilt all over[,] j other square Cabennett of Chyna gilt & painted[,] j litle flatt Chyna box gilt and painted[,] j nest of litle boxes of Chyna’.¹⁹⁵ Amongst the special items kept in the Cabinet [Room] at

¹⁸⁷ Andres, Glenn M., *The Villa Medici in Rome*, 2v., New York, 1976, v.I, p.323, v.II, p. 285, n.716.

¹⁸⁸ i.e. what is commonly referred to as “japanning”, that is European attempts to reproduce the lacquer made from *rhus vernicifera* usually with the use of shellac. Clifford Smith H., ‘An Italian Lacquered Table of the 17th Century’, *BM*, 29 (1916) 153-4, where this table is compared to wallpaper of the later 17th century.

¹⁸⁹ Impey and Jörg, p. 286.

¹⁹⁰ Illustrated and discussed in J. Hutt ‘A Japanese export lacquer chest in the Victoria & Albert Museum: Some further observations’, *Apollo*, 149, March, 1999, pp.22-24.

¹⁹¹ Jörg, Christiaan J.A., ‘Japanese Export Lacquer: Trade and Imitation’ in *Imitation and Inspiration: Japanese Influence on Dutch Art*, ed. Stevan van Raay, Amsterdam 1989, p. 40. There were also 9,227 pieces of porcelain, Boyer, M., op. cit., p.19.

¹⁹² e.g. a domed coffer presented to Gustavus Adolphus II in 1616, Impey, *Lacquerwork*, p.126.

¹⁹³ this was ‘inlaid wth a Chest bord of mother of Pearle sutable’.

¹⁹⁴ There were also several ‘Ibonie’ tables (Appendix III, p.17).

¹⁹⁵ Appendix III, pp. 19,20. There were also several ‘Ibonie’ cabinets. Amongst a varied assortment of objects in the Wardrobe, were ‘j lardge Chyna Chest or standard’ and ‘j ould Chyna targett’. There are

Salisbury House, there were also two boxes ‘of Chyna...with false bottome[s]’ one being ‘black and gilte’ on the exterior and ‘wth in red & guilt’. As with the *kinrande* porcelains discussed above, gilded objects seem to have been particularly appealing. It is more difficult to determine whether the ‘j highe back Chaire[,] j lowe back Chaire [and] ii longe quishions of Crimsen velvett imbrodred wth chyna Gould the frames redd & gilded’ were intended to appear ‘Chinese’ because the frames resembled lacquer, or whether their decoration resembled the surviving set of stools in the Leicester Gallery, Knoke.¹⁹⁶

Princess Elizabeth, later known as the “Winter Queen”, is said to have been offered a ‘cabinet of China worke’ by the States General of Holland in 1613 on the occasion of her marriage. This was not a single piece of furniture but included a bed, a cupboard, eight chests of various sizes and various dishes; some of this may have been imitation.¹⁹⁷

Salisbury’s collection is entirely exceptional; no other English inventory before 1614 contains such a wide range of Chinese objects as those recorded in his houses; consequently, the statement that ‘from...21 September 1614...the Jacobean vogue for Oriental lacquer ware can be dated’ can be demonstrated to be mistaken.¹⁹⁸

Imitation lacquer was already being made in Holland in 1609 by William Kick, before the shipment referred to above, which was evidently of a sufficiently high standard for one piece to be given to the Sultan of Turkey in 1612 as a pair to a genuine one, although none of these objects is known to survive.¹⁹⁹ Kick was granted a patent for eight years in 1609 to make lacquer in the ‘manner as the pieces brought here from the Indies’.²⁰⁰ This imitation indicates that lacquer was already known in the Netherlands and this may be through the Portuguese, possibly from cargoes captured during the Dutch struggle for control of trade. Jan Huyghen van Linschoten’s account of his voyages, mentioned above, includes in the description of Goa his comment that ‘other heathens...sell all sortes of bedstedes, stooles and such like stuffe, very cunningly covered over with Lacke, most pleasant to behold’.²⁰¹

various references to ‘Chyna’ amongst the unused fabrics.

¹⁹⁶ Appendix III, p.9.

¹⁹⁷ Impey and Jörg, p. 28.

¹⁹⁸ Boyer, M., *Japanese Export Lacquers from the Seventeenth Century in the National Museum of Denmark*, Copenhagen, 1959, p.19, referring to Northampton’s inventory.

¹⁹⁹ Jörg op.cit., p.47; Impey *Lacquerwork*, p. 136.

²⁰⁰ Impey and Jörg, p.341.

²⁰¹ *John Huighen van Linschoten, his Discourses of Voyages into ye Easte & West Indies, Devided into Foure Bookes*, printed at London by Iohn Wolfe (with a dedication to Julius Caesar, Master of Requests), Book I,

The 1614 Northampton inventory makes twelve references to “China”, in the context of both fabrics and furniture all of which were in the London house, not at Greenwich.²⁰²

Writing in 1971, Hans Huth dismissed these objects and the idea that Oriental objects were widely available in London at this time, but the evidence presented here would seem to contradict this.²⁰³ Whilst it is probable that the ‘one small table of *China* worke in golde and colours with flies and wormes’ at Northampton House is a japanned piece, others such as ‘a *China* guilte cabonett’ may well be a genuine object, even if more likely to be Japanese.²⁰⁴ It could have been a Namban piece, but could not have been purchased at the auction of the contents of the *Clove*, which took place after Northampton’s death.

Unusually, one reference is to ‘a square table of orientall stone inlaied’, as this term seldom appears, but this might be a *pietra dura* piece; not all these items were visible, a number being in store and a coherent scheme of decoration was clearly not intended.²⁰⁵

Northampton’s residence at Greenwich, although fully furnished, has a solitary item in this category: ‘a foldinge Indian screne’; it is probable that this object was either Japanese or Chinese, in the latter case of the type known today in the West as Coromandel.²⁰⁶

Coromandel is in India and the application of the name to pieces of imported Chinese incised lacquer probably arose from their importation via transshipment in India. This is another instance of a fundamental misunderstanding of eastern geography. Others, with an equal lack of discrimination, applied ‘China’ to all sorts of objects. For example, in March, 1616 William Smith wrote to Lord Arundel from Rome that he had been employed there ‘for the Cardinales, and other Princes of these parts, in workes after the China fashion w^{ch} is much affected heere’, and this reference is to imitation lacquer known as in England as “Japanning”.²⁰⁷ Smith was still in Rome in September that year.²⁰⁸ He was referred to by Inigo Jones as a ‘painter of burnisht worke’, which may be an oblique reference to this particular decorative effect, when he was said to have observed the removal of the bronze

p.65. Although Linschoten understood, at least partly, how lacquer was obtained, he was mistaken in believing at this date that it came from China (p.117).

²⁰² Shirley, op.cit.

²⁰³ Huth, H. *Lacquer of the West: the History of a Craft and an Industry 1550-1950*, Chicago, 1971, p. 12.

²⁰⁴ Northampton’s household goods were described ‘the like whereof could not elsewhere be gotten’, L.L. Peck ‘Building, Buying and Collecting in London’ in *Material London, ca. 1600*, ed. L.C. Orlin, Philadelphia, 2000, p.274.

²⁰⁵ Shirley, op. cit., p.364.

²⁰⁶ Shirley, op. cit., p.373.

²⁰⁷ M.F.S. Hervey, *The Life, Correspondence and Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel*, Cambridge, 1921, p. 501.

²⁰⁸ Personal communication Edward Chaney.

from the Pantheon in 1625.²⁰⁹ Japanning or the imitation of Japanese lacquer is usually believed to have begun with the publication of an illustrated treatise on the subject of ‘Japaning [sic] and Varnishing’ by John Stalker and George Parker in 1688; these examples demonstrate that this is not the case.²¹⁰

At Bolsover Little Castle, when the Northern Bedroom Closet, known as the Heaven Room, was decorated for Sir Charles Cavendish, the panelling (behind which are three cupboards) was painted green with gilded designs in generally “Oriental” style, which would later be known as ‘Chinoiserie’. It has often been suggested that this was applied in the late seventeenth century, after the appearance of Stalker & Parker’s publication. Although extensively restored, this is the only layer of decoration to have been applied to the panelling and predates the wall paintings above of a scheme for Sir William Cavendish dateable to after 1619.²¹¹

The Symondes inventory for a house at Cockesden taken in February 1610 on the death of the owner’s wife reveals numerous references to fabrics of ‘Indyan stuffe’, including ‘two window cushiones long of Indian clothe of goulde’ and in the owner’s chamber ‘the testore, vallens and curteans of streacked Indian stuff silke’.²¹² This is a further instance of the word “Indian” being applied indiscriminately to objects which probably came from various different places.

The contents of the *Clove* were auctioned on 20 December 1614 and included two ‘small trunckes or chests of Japan stuff guilded and set with mother of pearle’ which fetched £4.5s. and £5 and ‘a small cabanet with drawers guilded and inlaid and sett with mother of pearle’.²¹³ Despite Roe’s misconceptions regarding the geography of India, he became aware that ‘any faire China Bedsteeds, or cabinetes or truncks of Japan’ would be well received as ‘rich presents’ in India, although Antony Schorer writing between 1609 and 1614 stated that ‘Chinese lac-work is not much in demand, but some round, closed boxes

²⁰⁹ Howarth, D., *Lord Arundel and His Circle*, 1985, pp.56, 231.

²¹⁰ Stalker, J. and G. Parker, *Treatise of Japaning and Varnishing: Being a compleat Discovery of those Arts*, Oxford, 1688 (re-published with an introduction by H.D. Molesworth, 1960).

²¹¹ Research by Helen Hughes, English Heritage, 2004; personal communication.

²¹² Halliwell, J.O. *Ancient Inventories of Furniture, Pictures, Tapestry, Plate etc. Illustrative of the Domestic Manners of the English in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 1854, p.59-85.

²¹³ Irwin op.cit. These were made of the type of export lacquer called “namban”.

are sold [at Masulipatnam]'.²¹⁴ John Saris wrote that he had 'ritch Scritoires: Trunckes, Beoubes [screens], Cupps and Dishes of all sortes...of a most excellent varnish'.²¹⁵ The "Scritoires" or escritoirs, containing drawers behind doors, were based on European shapes; a namban example has been at Schloss Ambras since before 1596.²¹⁶ Thomas Bonner, who died in 1616 in the East India Company's service on board the *Expedition*, bequeathed a 'Japon screeture or boxe' to his sister-in-law.²¹⁷

The term Indian was still being applied with an equal lack of discrimination in 1636 when the description of Lord Arundel's embassy to Germany included the collection formerly belonging to the Emperor Rudolf II and stated that the seventeenth and eighteenth cupboards in the "Schant" Room contained "Indian Work".²¹⁸

Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that despite fundamental misunderstandings about geography, collectors in early seventeenth-century England valued and actively sought a wide variety of Oriental objects. These collectors understood the differences between porcelain and earthenwares and other classes of ceramic and their collections were not inspired by the consumption of "hot licquors", such as tea and coffee, both still unknown in England. Rare and unusual objects were marks of status, reserved for an élite group and were given as diplomatic gifts. Some of these objects were displayed, for example, those placed in the rooms described in the inventories as "Cabinet" rooms, rather than being considered as merely useful wares. Discriminating English collectors were far more innovative at a much earlier date than has previously been acknowledged. In discussions of the early seventeenth century, it is more usual to emphasise the importance of the Portuguese and, increasingly, the Dutch, but English collectors of 'Chyna' have generally been overlooked. The Countess of Arundel's Dutch Pranketing House at Tart Hall (inventory of 1641) has been cited as the first significant evidence of collecting and

²¹⁴ Foster, pp.119. 'Relations of Golconda in the early seventeenth century', ed. W.H. Moreland, *Hakluyt Society*, second series, 66. 1930, p.62.

²¹⁵ Impey, *Chinoiserie*, 111-2; it is possible that the screens were painted, rather than lacquered, Impey, *Lacquerwork*, p.130.

²¹⁶ Impey, *Lacquerwork*, p.126, ill. 1a. An almost identical example was acquired by the Ashmolean Museum Oxford in 1998.

²¹⁷ Strachan, M. and Penrose, B. eds., *The East India Company Journals of Captain William Keeling and Master Thomas Bonner 1615-17* Minneapolis 1971.

²¹⁸ Springell, F.C., *Connoisseur & Diplomat: The Earl of Arundel's Embassy to Germany in 1636*, 1963, p.72.

displaying ceramics, but the evidence presented here shows that this was not as innovative as has previously been supposed.²¹⁹ The collection at Wardour Castle, kept in a special structure ‘The Posselyn House’ predated Tart Hall by 35 years; no doubt, Wardour’s years in the service of Rudolf II influenced the formation of his collection.

None of the English collectors discussed here left any indication of their reasons for collecting these objects, however, the exclusivity and rarity of the objects must have been important to them, as well as the fact that the manufacture of porcelain and the production of lacquer remained entirely mysterious. This aspect is underlined by the presentation of pieces of porcelain to Elizabeth I, where the competitive spirit amongst courtiers was rife and the presentation of an unusual gift would ensure that the giver was noticed. Mieke Bal suggested that the first acquisition is accidental, made before the acquirer knows that they will become a collector: ‘when a series of haphazard purchases or gifts suddenly become a meaningful sequence’.²²⁰ This may well have been the case with those collections of “Chynaes” pieces discussed here.

During the reign of Elizabeth I it was not the case that the monarch was a pioneering collector, setting new trends to be avidly followed by the most prominent courtiers. Indeed, the reverse may be posited and it can be suggested on the basis of the evidence presented here that courtiers were the trendsetters here. Elsner and Cardinal in 1994 suggested that: ‘the truly tasteful collector, the one who creates taste instead of merely promulgating it, is...collecting rather *recherché* things or...has a different approach from everyone else’.²²¹ Such ideas may well have prompted early courtier collectors of Oriental objects.

Most of the pioneering collectors discussed above were also amongst the first collectors in early Jacobean England of Venetian paintings, which were to become the most sought-after paintings for English collectors in the 1620s, as discussed in Chapter Three. For example, Northampton’s 1614 inventory refers to ‘14 Venetian pictures of one bignes’.²²² Salisbury was sent a number of paintings from Venice by Sir Henry Wotton while he was ambassador

²¹⁹For example, *Kensington Palace and the Porcelain of Queen Mary II: Essays in association with the exhibition China Mania*, eds. M. Hinton and O. Impey, 1998, p. 69.

²²⁰Bal, M., ‘Telling Objects: A Narrative Perspective on Collecting’, in *The Cultures of Collecting*, op. cit., pp.98-115, 101.

²²¹Elsner and Cardinal, op. cit., p.3.

²²²These were in the Gallery at Northampton’s house at Greenwich; Shirley op. cit. p.372.

there, including the Palma Giovane of *Prometheus* [Royal Collection], which Salisbury promptly gave to Henry, Prince of Wales in 1609.²²³ Walter Cope, whose collection has already been mentioned, wrote on Salisbury's behalf to the next ambassador to Venice, Dudley Carleton, requesting 'auncient Master peeces of paintinge at a reasonable hand', stating that 'you cannot send a thinge more gracious'. Although no documents survive, either Carleton or Wotton must have supplied Salisbury with the two copies of Titian's portrait of *Caterina Cornaro, Queen of Cyprus* [original lost – copies at Hatfield House, The Marquess of Salisbury].²²⁴ As she died in 1510, this image probably falls into the category of imaginative portraiture and it is likely that Titian may never have seen her personally. If this supposition is correct, it places this painting conceptually in a similar vein to his imaginative portraits of the Caesars, the originals of which would later be owned by Charles I and of which copies proliferated (see Chapter Two, pp.94-7). The copies owned by Salisbury may well be the first examples in England of identifiable copies of a work by Titian, setting a trend to be followed by the major collectors of the next generation, such as Buckingham, Hamilton and Charles I, who all owned copies of works by Titian, where they could not obtain the originals (see Chapter Three).

Consequently, discriminating collectors in the early years of the seventeenth century in England were setting trends which would be eagerly followed by their successors, both in the collecting of Oriental objects (both genuine and imitation) and in collecting Venetian paintings or copies of them. This aspect of collecting will be discussed in Chapters Two and Three.

²²³ Bracken, 2002a, p.125 and fig.58.

²²⁴ Wethey, H., *The Paintings of Titian: Complete Edition*, 3v., 1969-75 (hereafter "Wethey"), II – The Portraits, L-9; Bracken, 2002, pp.122, 125, fig. 59.

CHAPTER TWO: Collecting and Commissioning Copies and Variants of Masterpieces

‘La copie bien faite d’un chef d’oeuvre fait supposer dans celui qui l’a exécutée une grande puissance de talent. Aussi rien n’est-il si rare qu’une bonne copie’. Etienne Jean Delécluze, *Traité élémentaire de peinture*, Paris 1842.²²⁵

Copies have been anathematised and even said to exist in a ghetto, ‘to copy...except in witty paraphrase, is to stand condemned’, ‘bad artists copy, good artists steal’.²²⁶

These two opposing points of view, the first of which celebrates the talented copyist and the others which disparage the practice co-existed throughout the period under discussion here. The pejorative view is that most commonly held today and yet, as this chapter seeks to demonstrate, this was not universally the case in either sixteenth- or seventeenth-century Europe. Copies of famous history paintings and miracle-working images, of which the originals were unobtainable, proliferated in almost all the major European collections and were usually acknowledged as such in the inventories made of those collections. Collectors passionately desired certain key works, leading to the production of copies of those works. However, artists were also often keen to make copies for a variety of reasons, including emulation of their distinguished predecessors. This section is concerned with the reproduction of history (narrative) paintings on both full and miniature scale, but not with mechanical processes of reproducing a work of art, nor with the deliberate production of fakes and forgeries, although both these categories will be mentioned. ‘A fake is an object that has been tampered with for the purpose of fraud’, ‘a forgery is an object made in fraudulent imitation of an existing item or an object that pertains [sic] to be something other than it actually is’ and ‘a copy is a direct replica of a pre-existing work or an artwork created in the style of a particular artist...not illegal...provided there are no attempts to make anyone believe it is an original work’.²²⁷ The possibility that some genuine copies have had their status changed over time and become fakes cannot be overlooked. Some reference will also be made to copies of sculpture. A list of some proposed definitions of

²²⁵ Quoted from *Raphael et la Seconde Main*, exh. cat. Geneva, 1984, p.125.

²²⁶ Maison, K.E., *Themes and Variations: five centuries of master copies and Interpretations*, 1960, p.7; T-shirt on sale in National Gallery, 2009.

²²⁷ Transcribed from labels in the display *Metropolitan Police Service’s Investigation of Fakes and Forgeries*, Victoria & Albert Museum 23/01-7/2/10.

copies and variants will be found at Appendix IV. Portraits were not considered to be of equal status to history paintings. Copies of portraits, which were made in very large numbers, will be selectively cited in certain unusual cases, as their production was almost always related to a desire to possess an image of the sitter, rather than a specific interest in who had painted the original. Reproductive prints which offered artists a relatively cheap source of ready-made ideas and allowed those unable to afford to purchase a painting the opportunity of having in their own homes a well-known or especially revered image are beyond the scope of this study.

In what follows, the theory and practice of copying will be discussed under various headings. First, a number of issues that essentially explore the textual history of the idea of the copy: the language used to describe it, the changing status of copies and copying and how critics have commented on copies in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The argument then moves on to those issues which challenge the notion that the copy is somehow simply derivative and secondary to 'original' works of art: the idea of emulation, the role of the master in encouraging copies as a method of teaching and distributing new ideas, the importance of copies as historical evidence of works admired and sometimes now lost to us, the place of the forgery as something recognised as disruptive of original practice. Finally, the thesis will look at the distribution of copies through artists themselves taking a record of their own and others' work, through agents and dealers, the issue of copies of sculpture in the way these cast light on painting (the principal material of this thesis), the acquisition of copies and their display not as originals but as testimony to the buyers' taste, discrimination and sharing in a common knowledge of the canon of great art.

The concept of the copy

Most major collectors, from c. 1550 onwards, knowingly owned and displayed copies of famous history paintings and continued to do so in the eighteenth century; this was one way of establishing themselves as persons of taste and knowledge. This was, perhaps, particularly appealing to men of rising status, to whom a recognised name was more important than supporting an unknown new artist. However, the development of public art auctions, the consequent growing importance of resale value and the notion of the entirely autograph work of art gradually ensured the disappearance of the copy from the collections of pre-eminent collectors.

Recently, a number of works on the market and in conservation studios have highlighted the continuing issue of the ‘copy’ and various cultural historians have commented upon it. These instances have a strong continuity with issues around copying in the past. Abraham van der Doort inventoried the painting of *The Calling of SS. Peter and Andrew* [Royal Collection], in the collection of Charles I as a copy (done by ‘one at Room, who is an Immetato^r of Caravagio’), although in the *Sale* of the king’s collection it was listed as ‘three Fisher men. done by Mich. Angelo Cororagio’, but at only £40 and it remained unsold.²²⁸ Late in 2006 this painting was elevated to the status of an original work of art by Caravaggio, thus attracting media attention, mainly on the grounds of its putative market value (£50 million or more’), despite the fact no painting from the Royal Collection can be sold.²²⁹ In July 2006, Christie’s sold a painting of *Salmacis and Hermaphroditus*, from “the store” at Knoke, which had formerly been considered to be a copy after a work by Sisto Badalocchio, but was convincingly redesignated an original work by Lodovico Carracci.²³⁰ In the absence of an inventory before 1706, it is not possible to establish a date for its arrival in that collection. In both cases, modern scientific methods of investigating works of art have been involved, which, while useful tools, cannot by themselves prove that a painting is by a particular artist and further evidence is needed. Such methods of investigation were not available until recently and, of course, played no part in the early examples to be discussed here, where the connoisseur’s judgement ruled. Conversely, a portrait of *Sir Thomas Wyatt*, attributed to Holbein, failed to sell on 5th July 2006, because of doubts about its authenticity.²³¹

In 1999, it seemed to Carmen Bambach that ‘Despite three centuries of modern connoisseurship and repeated attempts to solve the problem methodologically, the distinction between autography and copy remains among the most complex, elusive problems in the history of art’.²³² Writing in 2008, Richard Feigen regretted the decline of connoisseurship, which he defined as: ‘the identification of the artist by his handwriting’

²²⁸ Van der Doort, p.181; *Sale*, p. 315; *The Art of Italy in the Royal Collection: Renaissance and Baroque*, eds. L. Whitaker & M. Clayton, exh. cat., Queen’s Gallery, 2007, no. 92.

²²⁹ Daily Telegraph 10.11.06, p.3; this painting was frequently copied, at least 12 are in existence, Moir, A., *Caravaggio and His Copyists*, New York, 1976, p.14, who considered this to be the best.

²³⁰ Important Old Master Pictures, Evening Sale, lot 45; *AN*, September 2006, p.48. Sold for £7.4 million against top estimate of £1.2 million.

²³¹ *AN*, September 2006, p.48. Still on the market in 2010.

²³² Bambach, C.C., *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Theory and Practice, 1300-1600* Cambridge, 1999, p.81.

and he associated that decline with the transformation of art ‘into an “asset class”’. In this article, Feigen goes on to give several examples, which although not the same as those cited above, are generally similar; amongst them is the painting of a horse, attributed to van Dyck, which sold for £3 million in July, 2008, ‘but the jury is still out as to whether van Dyck painted it’.²³³

John Brewer’s 2009 analysis of the dispute in the early twentieth-century regarding a version of Leonardo’s *La Belle Ferronière*, which led to Joseph Duveen being sued in 1921, raises some interesting questions regarding connoisseurship and expert opinions, although he discusses few cases before the late nineteenth-century. As he points out, questions remain about the autograph status of both the version in the Louvre and the painting which is the focus of his book in 2009, making it impossible to determine which is the ‘original’, although the weight of scholarly opinion is against the latter version. Brewer also notes that Berenson and Duveen finally fell out over a disputed attribution to Titian.²³⁴ The painting which formed the subject of Brewer’s book was sold at Sotheby’s New York on 28th January, 2010, as ‘Follower of Leonardo da Vinci, probably before 1750’, considerably above the top estimate of US\$500,000 at US\$1,538,500; dealers were subsequently quoted as saying it was not worth more than US\$100,000.²³⁵ Whether its new owner intends to keep it, or whether it will once again return to the market remains to be seen. It is this writer’s opinion, on the basis of photographs, that this work cannot be by Leonardo and was probably painted in the eighteenth century. In October 2009 it was announced in the press that a ‘previously unknown portrait by Leonardo da Vinci potentially worth tens of millions of pounds is thought to have been discovered thanks to a fingerprint’ as that fingerprint resembled one to be ‘found on da Vinci’s work *St. Jerome*...painted...when he did not have assistants’.²³⁶ This method cannot be regarded as an entirely reliable. The image, in coloured chalk on vellum, has been christened *La Bella Principessa* and its connection with Leonardo has been doubted by numerous commentators, whilst, taking the opposite view, a former owner announced their intention to sue Christie’s over alleged misattribution.²³⁷ The probity of the fingerprint analyst has

²³³ Feigen, R.L., ‘The art factory and the death of the connoisseur’, *AN*, September, 2008, p.26.

²³⁴ Brewer, J., *The American Leonardo: A 20th-Century Tale of Obsession, Art and Money*, 2009; (this book does not include full citations of sources) p.82.

²³⁵ Information from Sotheby’s website accessed on 5/2/2010; *AN* March 2010.

²³⁶ Daily Telegraph 13 October 2009, p.2.

²³⁷ J. Wullschlager, *Financial Times*, 15-16/5/10; R. Dormant, *Daily Telegraph*, 13/4/2010; *AN*, June, 2010, p.77.

been questioned.²³⁸ In 1501 Leonardo was said by Fra Pietro da Novellara to have apprentices in his Florence workshop making copies, to which he ‘puts his hand from time to time’, although it is possible that they were occupied with making paintings based on original designs (not paintings) by the master.²³⁹ His own comments would seem to contradict the possibility of ever making a copy of a painting, unlike letters or sculpture: ‘painting alone remains noble...never bears children equal to itself’.²⁴⁰

Writing in 2004, Richard Spear expressed regret that works ‘whose originality is in question’ might be deaccessioned, expressing some optimism that ‘the wheel of taste and historical understanding [would turn] and copies [would be] appreciated once again’. He believed that there was a ‘rising appreciation of...individual styles [and] a concept of value residing in distinguishable artistic personalities’. He also noted the widespread practice of famous masters signing or sending out from their workshops as ‘original’ works which ‘they had scarcely touched’ and this includes both Titian and Rubens, as well as some less well-known figures (Appendix IV, Type F).²⁴¹ Henry Wotton in 1624 suggested that ‘when a Piece of Art is set before us, let the first Caution be, not to aske who made it, least the *Fame* of the *Author* doe captivate the *Fancie* of the *Buyer*’.²⁴² Wotton went on to explore the essential ingredients: ‘*con diligenza* ...ordinary diligence...*con studio*...learned diligence and *con amore*...loving diligence’ which when combined in the work of ‘an eminent *Author*, Then perchance *Titianus Fecit*...will serve the *Turne*, without farther Inquisition’.²⁴³ It is noteworthy that he chose Titian as his example, the artist whose work was the most popular with collectors at the Stuart court in those years (see Chapter Three). Those able to perceive that ideal combination for themselves were indeed few and far between. Almost a hundred years later, the painter Antoine Coypel in 1721 expressed the view that: “It is not a painting’s reputation that determines its merit; rather its merit must determine its reputation and I wish the *curieux* would address the question of what is good and bad instead of preoccupying themselves with authors, style, and originality”, which

²³⁸ Grann, D., ‘The Mark of a Masterpiece: the man who keeps finding famous fingerprints on uncelebrated works of art’, *The New Yorker*, 12-19 July, 2010, pp. 50-71.

²³⁹ O’Malley, M., *The Business of Art: Contracts and the Commissioning Process in Renaissance Italy*, Yale, 2005, p.223.

²⁴⁰ Holmes, *Artistic Exchange*..., p.38.

²⁴¹ Spear, R.E., ‘What is an original?’ in *The Italians in Australia: Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art*, ed. D.R. Marshall, Florence 2004, pp.17, 24, 28.

²⁴² *The Elements of Architecture: Collected by Henry Wotton, Knight, from the best Authors and Examples*, 1624.

²⁴³ Quoted in Muller, J.M., ‘*Con Diligenza, con studio, and con amore*’: Terms of Quality in the Seventeenth Century’ in *Rubens and His World*, eds. A. Balis et al, Antwerp, 1985, pp.273-278.

may have been intended to promote the work of living artists, over the collecting of works by famous artists from the past.²⁴⁴

The concept of the copy, therefore, is not simply about the intrinsic authenticity of the work, but also about shifting perceptions of what it means to have the skill to recognise a master's hand and constant debates about the relevance of a notion of the 'authentic', when quality should govern the 'value', artistic and monetary, of every work of art.

The intentions behind the practice of copying

A wide variety of different circumstances gave rise to the production of copies of works of art. These include both commissions from patrons and decisions made by artists themselves. Both full-scale copies of their own work and copies of works by other artists might be involved. Some of these would be exact replicas, but in other cases, variants would be produced. There was also demand for replicas of venerable religious images, which in some cases would be on a reduced scale, better suited to a domestic environment. Autograph replicas [Appendix IV, type A] might be produced because of problems with the original. For example, the measurements might not be correct and consequently the painting did not fit its intended space. Autograph replicas were also sometimes produced so that a particular group of people could each own one; for example, Palma Giovane's painting recording the ceremonial entry of Henri III to Venice exists in large numbers because each of the organisers of this complex event received one as a memorial.

Criticism of the first version of the painting might lead to the production of a second autograph version, thus, in 1602 Giovanni Baglione painted a second version [Appendix IV, type B] of his *Sacred and Profane Love* for Cardinal Benedetto Giustiniani [now Palazzo Barberini, Rome], because his fellow artists, Caravaggio and Orazio Gentileschi had made scathing remarks (recorded in a court case in 1603) about the first version [now Berlin].²⁴⁵ The principal changes consist in removing much of the armour from the figure of Sacred Love and in turning the face of the devil behind him towards the viewer, making the picture more dramatic. After the removal of Caravaggio's *Death of the Virgin* from

²⁴⁴ McClellan, A., 'Watteau's Dealer: Gersaint and the Marketing of Art in Eighteenth-Century Paris', *AB*, 78, 1996, pp.439-453, 449.

²⁴⁵ *Caravaggio e i Giustiniani: toccar con mano una collezione del Seicento*, exh. cat. Rome 2001, nos.D7 and D8.

S. Maria della Scala, Rome [formerly collection of Charles I, now Louvre], another painting was ordered from Carlo Saraceni [on loan to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, in January 2010] . However, the Discalced Carmelites were still not pleased, as they required an image in which the Virgin Mary appeared to be in *transito* rather than actually dead and Saraceni therefore had to produce a further version of the picture [Appendix IV, type B, *in situ*].

Autograph variants [Appendix IV, type B] might be occasioned where the client was dissatisfied and required alterations; for example, none of Caravaggio's first versions of *The Conversion of Saul* and *Crucifixion of St. Peter* [for the Cerasi Chapel, S. Maria del Popolo, Rome], nor *St. Matthew and the Angel* [Contarelli Chapel, S. Luigi dei Francesi, Rome, original destroyed] is in their intended original position, the *St. Matthew* being rejected by the church authorities. In each case, he painted second versions which are still in the chapels. In the case of the Cerasi Chapel, it is possible that Caravaggio himself decided to paint the second versions once he had the opportunity of seeing the structure of the chapel.²⁴⁶

Copies of images of Christ or the saints were considered to be a positive thing, helping to increase veneration. Copies of icons believed to have been painted by St. Luke were especially desirable. This veneration particularly applied to the miracle-working image of the Virgin Mary in S. Maria Maggiore, Rome, which was believed to possess 'apotropaic abilities' and according to one seventeenth-century commentator had only been 'sketched by Luke and then miraculously completed by angels'. John Evelyn noted there 'the Piece over the Altar esteemed of the hand of st. Luke if you will believe it', as well as the 'picture of Christ, paynted, as they say, by the hand of st. Luke to the life' at S. Giovanni in Laterano in November, 1644.²⁴⁷ Special permission was granted for a copy to be made for Francis Borgia, general of the Society of Jesus, in 1569 which then became the source for numerous further replicas to be made, not only for other Jesuits, but also for Philip II of

²⁴⁶ Caravaggio *Odescalchi: Le due versioni della 'Conversione di San Paolo' a confronto*, exh. cat., Rome, 2006. According to Mancini, these first versions 'sono copiatì' from the versions now in the chapel, which suggests that he had not seen them (they were then in the collection of Cardinal Giacomo Sannesio). The first version of the Cerasi Chapel *Saul* is in the Odescalchi Collection, Rome, while the first version of the *Crucifixion of St. Peter* was last recorded in Spain in 1691 [untraced], but its appearance may be reflected in what is said to be a copy in the Real Colegio Seminariode Corpus Christi, Valencia, which is one of six surviving versions in Spain. (Cat. no. 23 in *De Herrera a Velázquez: el primer naturalismo en Sevilla*, exh. cat. Seville, 2005.)

²⁴⁷ *The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E.S. de Beer, 6 v., Oxford, 1955, II, pp.244, 269 (hereafter: "Diary").

Spain, amongst others. These reproductions were considered to be of almost equal status to the original, as is demonstrated by Archbishop Carlo Borromeo saying his final prayers to one of these copies.²⁴⁸ This evidence directly contradicts the assertion of Benjamin, discussed in the Introduction, that copying deprives the original of its aura.

Several surviving images of Christ in profile, allegedly based on a carved Byzantine emerald, have recently been shown to be so similar to one another that the conclusion is drawn that this ‘indicates the existence of the sort of face pattern commonly used in...sixteenth and seventeenth century England’ and that ‘tracing was the means of such exact reproduction’.²⁴⁹ A clear description was given of such an image in one of the galleries at Hampton Court in 1610 by a German visitor, where its removal to a secular setting presumably deprived it of the possibility of veneration.²⁵⁰ In contrast to this, the circulation of copies of a cult image could assist in its dissemination to a wider audience.²⁵¹ It has been noted that the Duke of Lerma’s patronage of religious institutions included a number of works which were recorded at the time as copies of altarpieces by Tintoretto, Bassano, Daniele da Volterra, Sebastiano del Piombo and Guido Reni; the copyists are not named, but copies after altarpieces by one of the Carducho brothers may have originated in their workshop.²⁵²

Contracts provide further evidence of artists being required to reproduce existing works and requests for ‘[a] similar image to be set up at an associated site’; this was likely to occur when the commissioners were connected to one another, such as members of the same religious order.²⁵³ Workshop replicas intended for a less prestigious site might be delegated to the assistants.²⁵⁴ As Michelle O’Malley has noted, most of the terms in Italian contracts require a “similar” work, rather than a precise copy, with a few notable exceptions such as the second version of Leonardo’s *Virgin of the Rocks* [National Gallery], and the 1503 contract for Bramantino to make a copy of Leonardo’s *Last Supper*. She suggests that the evidence she has found demonstrates that “faithful” copies were intended to be sold

²⁴⁸ Ostrow, S.F., *Art and Spirituality in Counter-Reformation Rome: The Sistine and Pauline Chapels in S. Maria Maggiore*, Cambridge, 1996, pp.120,123,125,127.

²⁴⁹ Williams, R.L., ‘The Reformation of an Icon: “Portraits” of Christ in Late-Tudor England’ in *Art Reformed: Re-assessing the Impact of the Reformation of the Visual Arts*, eds. T. Hamling and R.L. Williams, Newcastle, 2007, p.72.

²⁵⁰ Williams 2007 p.73.

²⁵¹ Belting, H., *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art*, Chicago, 1994.

²⁵² Banner, L.A., *The Religious Patronage of the Duke of Lerma 1598-1621*, Farnham, 2009, pp.70,85,128,147.

²⁵³ Thomas, A., *The Painter’s Practice in Renaissance Tuscany*, Cambridge, 1995, p.214.

²⁵⁴ Ibid, p.233.

speculatively and ultimately for domestic use, while “similar” works were intended for public spaces; it should be noted that she is dealing only with fifteenth- and sixteenth-century cases recorded in notarial documents and that this will largely exclude the copies dealt with here.²⁵⁵ O’Malley concludes that unlike their Netherlandish contemporaries, ‘Italians were interested in unique works’, but the evidence presented here would suggest otherwise for a later period. Annabel Thomas, using the same documents which refer to ‘similitudine’, notes that ‘Renaissance patrons encouraged the making of copies’ and further states that copies could create ‘demand by establishing a strong...presence of the artist’s work’.²⁵⁶ However, Thomas makes insufficient distinction between precise copies and variants.

Copies on a considerably reduced scale [Appendix IV, type H – not miniatures] permitted the private owner to possess a replica of an already unobtainable famous work which was also too large to be accommodated in most houses. Veronese’s *Marriage at Cana*, 1563, originally painted for the refectory of S. Giorgio Maggiore, Venice, [removed in the Napoleonic era, now in the Louvre] was copied by twice by Johann König in 1606-7 (a lost miniature and a larger version in a private collection which is signed and dated) and by several other painters early in the C17th, including two anonymous artists whose copies survive.²⁵⁷ The intended destination of these latter copies is not known, although they could have been made purely as a speculative venture in view of demand, as it was recorded in 1619 that “l’hanno voluta copia diversi Principi...il Re di Francia, et Spagna et li Principi di Fiandra” in Olmo’s history of the church.²⁵⁸ Vincenzo Mancini has suggested that in the first decades of the C17th, the production of copies of this picture was “pletorica” (over-abundant), because Veronese was so much admired at this time, but his pictures were either so expensive or unavailable that copies had to be obtained in order to “complete” collections of paintings.²⁵⁹

In other instances, clients wanted to own examples of work by particular artists, thus Cardinal Bernardino Spada persuaded Guido Reni to allow the copying of his *Abduction of Helen* [1629, now Louvre] for Spada’s collection in Rome [copy still at Palazzo Spada].

²⁵⁵ O’Malley, 2005, p.222.

²⁵⁶ Thomas op. cit. p.221.

²⁵⁷ Figs. 11 (Vicenza, Musei Civici) and 12 (Fondazione Giorgio Cini) in *Il Miracolo di Cana: l’originalità della ri-produzione*, exh. cat. Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Venice, 2007.

²⁵⁸ *Il Miracolo...*, p.69.

²⁵⁹ Mancini, V., ‘La “zoglia” di Paolo Veronese a San Giorgio Maggiore’, in *Il Miracolo...*, pp.29-47, 45.

The majority of the examples of copying cited above were therefore occasioned by the demands of clients, whether demanding a second autograph copy, expecting their criticisms to be met, or, as in the case of religious orders, to promote devotion.

However, artists also wanted to own and make copies for a variety of reasons, including improving their technique, to help establish a new iconographic tradition, training themselves, building up a workshop “library” of images, keeping records of works sent away to a distant location, for their own pleasure – even to challenge the pre-eminence of their distinguished predecessors (as will be shown on pp.81-2).

Collectors and Copies

‘No respectable seventeenth-century collection was considered complete without Italian paintings, ideally by Raphael, Titian or other great masters of the sixteenth century’.²⁶⁰ For collectors, copies are a way of possessing what they cannot own or of displaying their possessions in more than one place. They could also demonstrate the owners’ good taste and knowledge of the art of the past and appreciation of works by masters of great repute. For those anxious to enhance their social standing, possessing a copy of an original work of art owned by someone of superior rank could assist their ambitions. Emulating the ruler’s collection was therefore a particularly common practice. In this context, it has been suggested by Mickaël Szanto that the taste for Italian paintings in seventeenth-century France was formed by the example of Marie de’ Medicis, and then by the first gentlemen of the bedchamber, who also wanted to own such works. This taste resulted in increasing numbers of French painters travelling to Rome to study.²⁶¹ This is, of course, prior to the formation of the Academie Royale de Peinture in 1648 and, more importantly, its Roman offspring in 1666, which formalised this practice. Some painters were sent to Italy for the specific purpose of making copies for French collectors and others such as Charles Errard, who were already there, gained further employment in this way.²⁶²

²⁶⁰ *Uylenburgh & Son: Art and commerce from Rembrandt to de Lairese 1625-1675*, exh. cat. Dulwich Picture Gallery, 2006, p.81.

²⁶¹ Szanto, M., ‘Gli itinerari delle pitture dall’Italia alla Francia nel primo Seicento: dalle vie diplomatiche ai circuiti bancari’, in *The Art Market in Italy...*, pp. 413-418.

²⁶² Ibid.

In Rome, the practice of copying sixteenth-century masterpieces was well established and numerous payments to artists for making copies are recorded in the Barberini documents studied by M.A. Lavin. These include four painted copies from Raphael's *Acts of the Apostles* tapestries [Vatican] made in 1639 by artists under the direction of Andrea Sacchi and five copies of images from the Stanze, mainly used as overdoors, in the 1644 inventory of Antonio Barberini.²⁶³ Although these do not appear to survive, from the descriptions they are probably single figures or pairs excerpted from the main scenes, for example Aeneas and Anchises from the *Fire in the Borgo* [Appendix IV, type J]. Evelyn remarked in early 1645 that the Stanze were 'cal'd among the Virtuosi, the Paynters Academy, because you shall never come into them, but you find some young man or other designing from them', despite his belief that they were 'all of them by the hand of the famous Julio Romano'.²⁶⁴ Similar excerpted figures, in this case from the frescoes in the Sistine Chapel can still be seen in the Galleria of Palazzo Ricci-Sacchetti, Rome, set amongst stucco decoration said to have been designed by Antonio da Sangallo the Younger and Nanni di Baccio Bigio in 1543-54. It is not certain who painted these images, which according to some sources are attributed to the little-known Giacomo Rocca, a pupil of Daniele da Volterra. At Palazzo Barberini, there were also several copies after Titian and in 1642 copies were made of Caravaggio's *Cardsharps* and *Lute Player*; the former was frequently copied in the seventeenth century (see below p.87).²⁶⁵ As discussed below (pp.117-8), copies were considered to be suitable diplomatic gifts by the Barberini family and various rulers.

Why were collectors not more concerned about the status of the works in their collections? Attitudes in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were very different from modern perceptions, as discussed above at the beginning of this chapter. While some may have been deceived, the focus of this research is on those who welcomed copies into their galleries and, on the basis of the surviving evidence, they appear to be in the majority. Genuinely avid collectors wanted to own a work or works by a particular master artist and if they could not possess the original then a copy was the next best thing (this is quite apart from reproductive prints, generally excluded here). We know from a letter that in 1581 Francesco Maria della Rovere provided a list (now lost) to his agent in Rome of the

²⁶³ Lavin, M.A., *Seventeenth-Century Barberini Documents and Inventories of Art*, New York, 1975, p.510.

²⁶⁴ *Diary*, II, p. 299.

²⁶⁵ Lavin, op. cit. p. 474.

paintings there of which he wished to possess copies.²⁶⁶ In 1603 Marchese Camillo Capilupi's inventory refers to his copies, including the Twelve Caesars after Titian, and to his desire that they remain in his Roman home, having been valued by 'valenti huomini pittori di grandissimo prezzo'. These were presumably the set bequeathed by Bishop Ippolito Capilupi in 1580 and would consequently have been considered family heirlooms.²⁶⁷ Harold Wethey's catalogue raisonné records the bequest of 1580, but not the Marchese's 1603 inventory.²⁶⁸ The *Caesars* later belonged to Charles I (see pp.94-7). The large number of early copies after works by Caravaggio is a clear example of this aspect of collecting.²⁶⁹

Hessel Miedema, referring to the northern Netherlands, asserted that 'it was not until the later 17th century that it is evident that an original was rated above a copy'.²⁷⁰ As De Marchi and Van Miegroet have shown in their essay, discussed in the Introduction, the price differential between originals and copies at auction in the Netherlands was considerably less than might have been expected, so the research conducted by these scholars is underlining the fact that copies were not anathematised in the seventeenth century.

The distinguished Parisian collector Pierre Crozat (1665-1740), acted as agent for the Regent of France in making acquisitions in Italy for the Orléans collection and was a supporter of contemporary artists such as La Fosse and Watteau. His death inventory contains 461 paintings, principally Italian. His collection was described by one contemporary as 'boast[ing] the largest number of treasures in the way of paintings and objects of curiosity ever assembled by a private individual'.²⁷¹ Despite this he displayed copies of works by, among others, Veronese (*Marriage at Cana*), Correggio (the pendants *Allegory of Science*, *Hercules at the Crossroads*) and Federico Barocci (*Flight into Egypt*, *Adoration of the Infant Jesus*) in his Paris mansion in rue de Richelieu. Although Crozat also owned original drawings by Barocci he was apparently happy to display these copies. Crozat was an important patron for Watteau, who made paintings of the *Seasons* for

²⁶⁶ Shearman, J., *Raphael in Early Modern Sources (1483-1602)*, 2v., 2003, p.1291 (hereafter: "Shearman, *Raphael*").

²⁶⁷ Shearman, *Raphael*, p.1285.

²⁶⁸ Wethey, III: The Mythological and Historical Paintings, pp.43-7 & 235-40.

²⁶⁹ Moir, op. cit. Only ten out of 307 copies identified by Moir were signed by the copyists, none of whom was Italian.

²⁷⁰ Miedema, H., 'The appreciation of Paintings around 1600' in *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art 1580-1620*, exh. cat. Amsterdam 1993, pp.122-135, 127.

²⁷¹ Rosenberg, P., 'Watteau's Copies After the Old Masters', in *Watteau and His World: French Drawing from 1700 to 1750*, exh. cat. New York 1999, pp.50-55, p.53.

Crozat's dining room, based on original designs supplied by Charles de la Fosse. Crozat also advocated artistic training through copying not only the academic favourites Raphael and the Carracci, but also Titian, Veronese and Pietro da Cortona. Although the idea of reproductive engravings of the Italian paintings in the Royal collection originated with the Regent himself, it was Crozat who was responsible for seeing it through. The project was never completed as originally envisaged, but it was innovative, not least in its inclusion of the provenance of the works of art reproduced, something not previously seen on engravings. As discussed below (p.102), provenance research was virtually unknown in the seventeenth century. Crozat's correspondence with the Duke of Devonshire reveals how anxious he was to acquire any remaining paintings from the collection formed by Charles I.²⁷²

A number of collectors owned both the original work and a copy, or copies, of that same work. Charles I is a notable example of this type of collector (see discussion of his collection in Chapter Three, pp.174-192). In those cases, a high standard of replication must have been required in order that the copy should not be too obvious, but perhaps just obvious enough. In other cases, it is quite possible that the owner of the copy had never seen the original painting, but knew of it by reputation, or through the medium of reproductive engraving. These circumstances may have permitted a lower standard of replication. The emergence of the reproductive print for the first time in the sixteenth century made a considerable contribution in this respect.²⁷³

There are numerous stories of deception by copy, but most of these tales are designed to enhance the status of the artist, rather than to depreciate the status of the collector. Vasari tells us that Michelangelo 'counterfeited sheets by the hands of various old masters, making them so similar that they could not be detected...Nor did he do this with any other purpose but to obtain the originals from the hands of their owners by giving them the copies, for he admired them...and sought to surpass them in his own practice; on which account he acquired a very great name'.²⁷⁴ Vasari does not appear to take a moral stand on what sounds remarkably like theft by deception. This is essentially the same story as that told

²⁷² Stiffman, M., 'Les tableaux de la collection de Pierre Crozat: Historique et Destinée d'un Ensemble Célèbre, Établis en partant d'un Inventaire après Décès Inédit (1740)', *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, 72, Juillet-Décembre, 1968, pp. 11-144. The present whereabouts of most of these copies is now unknown.

²⁷³ Bury, M., *The Print in Italy 1550-1620*, exh. cat., London, 2001.

²⁷⁴ Giorgio Vasari 'Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects' trans. G. du C. de Vere, 1996, 2 v. II, p.646. Condivi, A., *The Life of Michelangelo*, trans. A.S. Wohl, Pennsylvania, 1999.

by Condivi referred to below (p.92), of which Vasari in 1568 was no doubt aware. Vasari does not, however, explain how this assisted Michelangelo in acquiring ‘a very great name’ and does not refer to any negative consequences.

Owners of these copies may have owned imitations of other types of object, such as some of the “Oriental” pieces of furniture in Chapter One. Given the pride suggested in the above discussion of possessing a blatant, if well-produced, copy, there may have been some reputation to be gained by having a collection of copies of different kinds of objects as a way of demonstrating a sense of discrimination and knowledge that the prototypes of these things were a shared culture amongst collectors.

The historical status of copies and copying

Making a copy may be seen as an ‘expression of admiration, the profound regard of one artist for another’ or ‘hero worship’.²⁷⁵ ‘A copy by a great master is always an original work’ was the opinion expressed by Görel Cavalli-Björkman in 2010, referring to Rubens.²⁷⁶ The list of distinguished artists active as copyists from the Renaissance to the twentieth-century is enormous, encompassing artists as various as Rubens, Gainsborough, Gericault, Degas, Gauguin and Cezanne. Delacroix’s copy of Rubens’s *Miracles of St. Benoît*, which is slightly smaller than the original, survives in the Musée des Beaux Arts, Brussels, mainly revealing his interest in the earlier artist’s technique. Degas made numerous copies of Old Master paintings such as that of Mantegna’s *Crucifixion* c. 1861 [Musée des Beaux Arts, Tours; original in the Louvre]. Aged 18, Degas stated his commitment to copying and his belief that only after so doing could an artist progress to make a study of a radish from nature.²⁷⁷ However, he did not collect paintings by the Old Masters, even when he had the opportunity to do so.²⁷⁸ He also knowingly owned several copies such as that by Delacroix of Rubens’s *Henri IV Entrusts the Regency to Marie de’ Medici* [Los Angeles County Museum of Art] and, on a more contemporary note,

²⁷⁵ Maison, op. cit., p.12; Mould, P. ‘Gainsborough Dupont...Copying van Dyck’, *BAJ*, 7, 1, 2006, pp.45-54.

²⁷⁶ *Dutch and Flemish Paintings III: Flemish Paintings c. 1600-c.1800*, (catalogue of the Nationalmuseum Collection), G. Cavalli-Björkman et al, Stockholm, 2010, p. 273.

²⁷⁷ “Il faut copier et recopier les maîtres...”, Musée des Beaux-Arts de Tours, Guide des Collections Paris 2007, p.110.

²⁷⁸ *The Private Collection of Edgar Degas*, exh. cat. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1997, fig. 86 & p. 105, n.18.

Gauguin's copy of Manet's *Olympia* [private collection].²⁷⁹ Degas was no doubt later aware of the Musée des Etudes (Ecole des Beaux Arts) in 1834 (coincidentally the year of his birth) containing full-scale copies of 'the work of classical masters', which had enjoyed the support of Ingres (himself a copyist of Raphael). The idea was revived in 1871 as the Musée des Copies, but met with considerable criticism, owing not only to a change in taste, but also to political in-fighting, and it closed in 1873, with the copies being dispersed, in many cases to provincial museums.²⁸⁰ The concept of exhibiting copies in this way has not completely disappeared, as Ernst van de Wetering asserted in 2006 that 'exhibitions [of life-sized reproductions] could contribute significantly to the democratisation of art'.²⁸¹ In making this statement, van de Wetering is, of course, making reference to the ideas of Benjamin discussed in the introduction.

Occasionally, copying may take the form of criticism or challenge as in Cézanne's *Modern Olympia* [first version 1870, private collection; second version 1874 Musée d'Orsay]; this painting belongs to a small group which are variants of works by Manet.²⁸² It has been suggested that Cézanne had 'taken up Manet's subjects as if with a determination to "beat" him on his own ground' or that his motive was to 'poke fun at his elder'; if that is so, Cézanne did not succeed as he included them in his first public exhibition, the first Impressionist show in 1874, which Manet refused to join and where Cézanne's paintings were heavily criticised.²⁸³ However, such a stance is rare, and in this case refers to a recent work of art, not to an "Old Master". Manet's own paintings were also criticised, but owe a clear debt to his study of not only Spanish masters, such as Velazquez, but also in the case of his *Olympia*, his study of the *Venus of Urbino*, by Titian.

The concept of an autograph painting, in which only a single hand, that of a named painter, can be detected has almost entirely taken hold and nothing else is deemed acceptable to a modern audience. Speaking in 2008, Evelyn Welch attributed this to the appearance of Vasari's publications, which had emphasised the notion of personal authorship and the artistic biography.²⁸⁴ The presence of the "*sua mano*" clause in artists' contracts has been noted from the beginning of the fourteenth century, but its principal purpose seems to have

²⁷⁹ Ibid., figs. 211, 67.

²⁸⁰ Boime, A., 'Le Musée des Copies', *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, LXIV, October 1964, pp.237-247.

²⁸¹ AN, October, 2006, p.32.

²⁸² Rewald, J., *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne: A Catalogue Raisonné*, 1996, 2v., nos. 164, 166, 171, 225.

²⁸³ Rewald, pp.134,164-5.

²⁸⁴ "The Original", BBC Radio 4, 1.30 p.m. 21st September, 2008.

been to prevent artistic sub-contracting, rather than actually representing the unlikely concept that Duccio could have painted the *Maestà* single-handed.²⁸⁵ By the beginning of the sixteenth century, in six known cases this clause seems intended to ensure that an artist painted certain specified parts of a particular work, and personally supervised the rest. In all these examples, the artist named was known to be the head of a successful workshop, not an individual working alone, and the patrons wanted to ensure that his participation was visible.²⁸⁶

There can have been no question of subsequent market value playing any part in those examples of the “*sua mano*” clause in contracts for frescoes, as they could not be removed from their original positions, such as that of 1487 between Filippino Lippi and Filippo Strozzi for the family chapel in S. Maria Novella, although the patrons undoubtedly wanted value for money.

The act of copying for a variety of purposes has persisted for many centuries. Copying works of art dates back to Classical antiquity and much of our knowledge of Greek bronze sculpture derives from Roman marble copies, which continue to be highly prized (for example, the *Apollo Belvedere*).²⁸⁷ Pliny described the *Laocoön* as “of all paintings and sculptures, the most worthy of admiration” and as his work was well known from the Renaissance onwards, this probably helped to inspire the numerous versions of this sculpture produced in later periods.²⁸⁸ It has sometimes been suggested that the Vatican *Laocoön* is not itself the original; this revolves around two problems originating in Pliny’s description. He stated that the original was made *ex uno lapido* (from a single block) and he stated that he saw the original in “the house of the Emperor Titus”.²⁸⁹ Neither of these statements tallies with the Vatican sculpture, as it is not made from a single block and the exact location of its re-discovery in 1506 was not the same. Later in the sixteenth century, other “*Laocoöns*”, or fragments thereof, were discovered, prompting one commentator to remark that “the ancients were accustomed – just as the moderns are accustomed – to make

²⁸⁵ O’Malley, M., ‘Late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century painting contracts and the stipulated use of the painter’s hand’ in *With and Without the Medici: Studies in Tuscan Art and Patronage 1434-1530*, eds. E. Marchand and A. Wright, 1998, p.155. Spear, R.E., ‘Di Sua Mano’, in *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, Supplementary Volumes*, I, Michigan, 2002, pp.79-98.

²⁸⁶ O’Malley, 1998.

²⁸⁷ It has been suggested that this is more likely to be an original than a replica, Varner, E.R., ‘Reading Replications: Roman Rhetoric and Greek Quotations’, *AH*, 29, 2006, pp. 280-303, 289.

²⁸⁸ Balfour, I., ‘Sculpting Pain and Poetry: Laocoon among the Germans’ in *Towards a new Laocoön*, exh. cat. Henry Moore Institute, 2007, pp.29-32, 29; *D’Après l’Antique*, exh. cat. Louvre, 2001, pp.228-273.

²⁸⁹ Koortbojian, M., ‘Pliny’s Laocoön?’ in *Antiquity and its Interpreters*, Cambridge, 2000, eds. A. Payne, A. Kuttner and R. Smick, pp.199-216.

copies of such rare things”, going on to cite a version of Michelangelo’s *Pietà* [original St. Peter’s] in Santa Maria dell’Anima as supporting evidence (see below) and there were two versions of the Farnese Hercules in the courtyard of Palazzo Farnese, Rome.²⁹⁰

The *Laocoön* presented a source of fascination and challenge to Renaissance sculptors. Michelangelo allegedly refused to make a copy, or to “restore” the damaged original.²⁹¹ Vasari describes Baccio Bandinelli’s characteristic response to the request that he should make a copy of it ‘he could make one not merely equal to it, but even surpassing it in perfection’.²⁹² First mentioned in the documents in January 1520, this was completed in 1531; the contract of 21 May 1520 specifies that the copy is to be the same size as the original.²⁹³ This prominently signed copy is that now in the Uffizi, having been commissioned by Leo X as one of a number of diplomatic gifts for François I, but in this case not delivered.²⁹⁴ According to the diary kept by the Venetian Marin Sanudo in an entry for May 1523: ‘the king of France...asked Pope Leo to give him the statue...The pope promised that he would, but so as not to deprive the Belvedere of it, he would have a copy made to give to the king. The figures of the two boys have already been made...but if the sculptor had lived to be 500 years old and had made a hundred copies, they would not look like the original.’²⁹⁵ Sanudo greatly admired the *Laocoön*, thinking it superior to the *Apollo Belvedere*; he does not name the maker of the copy, but it is likely to be Bandinelli. In 1540 Primaticcio ‘had a mould taken from the Laocoon, and the bronze cast that came from this mould was without restorations...and shows the group before a piece of Laocoon’s right shoulder was cut off’.²⁹⁶ This constitutes one of a number of significant examples of copies which can help to inform us about lost or mutilated works of art. It seems as though the *Laocoön* was frequently copied in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, whereas the *Apollo Belvedere* was the more favoured in the eighteenth century. This may have been prompted by the competition organised by Bramante in 1507 or 1508 between Sansovino and three other sculptors ‘to make copies of the newly discovered

²⁹⁰ Koortbojian, op. cit., pp.206-7; for copies of Michelangelo’s *Pietà*, see below.

²⁹¹ Viljoen, M., ‘Laocoon’s Snakes: The reception of the group in Renaissance Italy’ in *Towards a New Laocoon*, p.21.

²⁹² Vasari *Lives*, II, p.273.

²⁹³ Waldman, L.A., *Baccio Bandinelli and Art at the Medici Court: A Corpus of Early Modern Sources*, Philadelphia, 2004, docs. 109, 110, 113, 133.

²⁹⁴ Ill. 96 in Brummer, H.H., *The Statue Court in the Vatican Belvedere*, Stockholm, 1970.

²⁹⁵ *Venice Città Excelentissima: Selections from the Renaissance Diaries of Marin Sanudo*, eds. P.H. Labalme and L.S. White, Baltimore, 2008, p. 468.

²⁹⁶ Brummer, op. cit., p.89.

group...which [contest] was judged by Raphael'.²⁹⁷ The winner was Sansovino's wax [now lost], from which a bronze was cast, which then belonged to Cardinal Grimani. Bruce Boucher suggests that this probably resembled the version in the Bargello, which may be by Sansovino. The Grimani version was given to Jean, Cardinal of Lorraine by the Venetian Council of Ten in 1534 [now lost]. Consequently, by 1534 there was a bronze copy, which predated the restorations of 1532-3 and was closer to the sculpture's condition when excavated, in France and potentially available for study there; this is an example of the role of copies in the dissemination of ideas and artistic inspiration. Sansovino also made a reduced stucco copy in 1525, which was ordered by Pietro Aretino for Federico Gonzaga, marquess of Mantua [lost], which was larger than the wax.²⁹⁸ There are also subsequent derivations which take the original composition and either fragment or re-order it; these include El Greco's painting [Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York] and the first sculptural example appears to be that in bronze by Adriaen de Vries in 1623 [Stockholm]. Seventeenth-century English visitors to Rome were enthusiastic about the *Laocoön*, Nicholas Stone the Younger, son of the sculptor and master mason, who was travelling with his brother Henry (see Chapter Three, pp.214-215) admiring it in April, 1639.²⁹⁹ In early 1645, John Evelyn also admired the *Laocoön* on a visit to the Vatican, clearly acknowledging his debt to Pliny.³⁰⁰ The desire to emulate ancient sculpture also produced a number of fakes and forgeries, including Michelangelo's own *Sleeping Cupid* (original lost), subsequently owned by Isabella d'Este and then by Charles I (see below pp. 92, 129). In 1568 Cardinal Granvelle was said to have stated his preference for a perfect modern copy after the antique to an imperfect ancient sculpture.³⁰¹

Roman artists had produced numerous copies in admiring emulation of Greek originals, such as those displayed in the Forum Augustum, which evoked a previous Golden Age, whilst simultaneously suggesting by analogy the benefits of Augustus' rule.³⁰² Some of these copies were signed conspicuously, which may suggest that they were valued as works

²⁹⁷ Brummer, op. cit., pp.101-2.

²⁹⁸ Boucher, B., *The Sculpture of Jacopo Sansovino*, 2v., 1991. Boucher shows that the date usually given of 1510 is incorrect. The stucco is Boucher cat. 84.

²⁹⁹ Spiers, W.L., 'The Note-book and Account Book of Nicholas Stone', *Walpole Society*, VII, 1918-19, p. 172.

³⁰⁰ *Diary*, II, p.304.

³⁰¹ The original of Michelangelo's sculpture is lost, although there are several versions of it, for example, that at Corsham Court. *D'Après l'Antique*, op. cit., p.49 (author's translation).

³⁰² Varner op. cit., 282.

of art in their own right.³⁰³ Aristotle took the view that mimesis was permissible as a process ‘of construction, concentration and composition, with a corresponding notion of verisimilitude which he derived...from a correspondence between the imitation as a whole and the perceiving mind of the spectator’.³⁰⁴ In 1654 Emanuele Tesauro recommended imitation as a means of study with caution: ‘Imitating Praxiteles’ Apollo does not mean transporting it from the Cortile del Belvedere into one’s own loggia, but carving another piece of marble to the same proportions, so that Praxiteles...would...say “This Apollo is not mine, yet it is mine”’.³⁰⁵ Tesauro’s comment shows him making reference to the most famous sculptor of the ancient world, giving him the status of one to be emulated, although the sculpture is no longer attributed to him.

Copies of portraits were produced in large numbers from the reign of the Emperor Augustus onwards, frequently a menial task assigned to assistants rather than the master artist, and these will mostly be excluded from consideration here, with a few exceptions. In the sixteenth century Paolo Giovio, inspired by the Roman historian Varro’s *Imagines*, formed a collection of portraits of famous men, which was then copied by other collectors such as Cosimo I de’ Medici and the Archduke Ferdinand II of the Tyrol [Schloss Ambras].³⁰⁶

Copies of portraits of monarchs in sets were common in English sixteenth and seventeenth-century collections, but only the most innovative collectors owned copies of history paintings. It was generally considered that even a mediocre painter could produce a tolerable portrait, but that history painting required not only skill but intellectual ability as well. History painting should also either depict a morally uplifting event or action derived from a narrative source, to inspire the viewer to emulation, such as the *Continence of Scipio*, or something disgraceful which would have the opposite effect. Human figures, ideally life-size, needed to be correctly depicted in history painting, but usually this type of painting required the depiction of several of them in action and that they should be shown with decorum (i.e. behaviour and appearance appropriate to the action of the story). This concern was frequently repeated by commentators from Leon Battista Alberti in the C15th

³⁰³ Marvin, M., ‘Roman Sculptural Reproductions or Polykleitos: The Sequel’ in *Sculpture and its Reproductions* eds. A. Hughes and E. Ranfft, 1997, pp.7-28.

³⁰⁴ Puttfarken, T., ‘The Dispute about Disegno and Colorito in Venice: Paolo Pino, Lodovico Dolce and Titian’ in *Kunst und Kunsttheorie 1400-1900*, eds. P. Ganz et al, Wiesbaden 1991, pp.75-95, 91.

³⁰⁵ *Italy in the Baroque: Selected Readings*, ed. & trans. B. Dooley, 1995, p.468.

³⁰⁶ Lightbown, R., ‘Charles I and European Princely Collecting’ in *The Late King’s Goods* op. cit., pp.53-72, 59.

onwards.³⁰⁷ In England, there are few commentators before the late C16th, but starting with Richard Haydocke's translation of Lomazzo's *Trattato dell'Arte* in 1598 (see Chapter Three pp.144-146), several lament the lack of skilled history painters, as the taste for what Aglionby as late as 1685 called "face painting" had dominated in England and he perceived this situation to be in need of remedy.³⁰⁸ Jonathan Richardson was still lamenting the lack of knowledge and 'Lovers of Painting' in England in 1719 when he said that 'so few here in England have consider'd that to be a Good Connoisseur is fit to be part of the Education of a Gentleman'.³⁰⁹

It can be seen from the above that copying was a well-established practice dating back to antiquity and it was considered valuable by many artists as part of the learning process, a practice institutionalised at the artists' academies in Florence (1563) and Paris (1648, refounded 1663). It was also, clearly, as this section has shown, a practice that brought the values, achievements and power of an earlier 'golden age' to the present and that particularly the copies of the great narratives (in sculpture and in paint) were believed to be moral examples for contemporary times.

Methods of Copying

Criticism of copying during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries frequently revolved around the methods used and the injuries sustained by the originals in the process, rather than accusations of plagiarism. Several of the methods described below were listed by the notable seventeenth-century patron and collector Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani in an essay in letter form, without criticism of the ways in which copies were made, even admitting that they could surpass the original, but rather expressing concern that if the copier were 'inexpert and mean in spirit', the results might be unsatisfactory.³¹⁰

Tracing was a particularly widespread, but contentious method of copying and its use by Titian, Cavaliere d'Arpino, Caravaggio, Velasquez and van Dyck, as well as others has

³⁰⁷ Alberti, L.B., *On Painting and On Sculpture*, ed. C. Grayson, 1972.

³⁰⁸ Haydocke, R., *A tracte containing the artes of curious paintinge*, Oxford, 1598; Borenius, T., 'An Early English Writer on Art', *BM*, 39, 1921, pp.188-195.

³⁰⁹ Quoted in Jenkins, S., *Portrait of a Patron: the Patronage and Collecting of James Brydges, 1st Duke of Chandos (1674-1744)*, Aldershot, 2007, p.116.

³¹⁰ Engass, R., and Brown, J., *Italian & Spanish Art 1600-1750: Sources and Documents*, Evanston, Illinois, 1999, p.17.

been noted.³¹¹ In these cases it was being used by artists in the studio to replicate their own paintings, sometimes precisely, sometimes with minor variations, although the latter is more common in order that the artist might demonstrate his individuality and ‘invention’. The example of Titian was eloquently demonstrated in the version of the exhibition about this artist mounted in Madrid in 2003.³¹² Narrative paintings by Titian which were most frequently replicated in his studio include *Ecce Homo* and the *Penitent Magdalene* (both ½ length single figure compositions) as well as *Danae* and the *Venus and a Musician* subjects (whose format is that of a horizontal rectangle, encompassing two or more figures).³¹³ The *Venus and a Musician* and *Penitent Magdalene* were represented in Charles I’s collection (see Chapter Three p.181, 186). A multi-figure composition by Titian which seems to have been traced is the *Diana and Callisto* [on loan to National Gallery of Scotland] of which there is a version in Vienna which ‘exactly follows the figure composition of the original’.³¹⁴ The Vienna version was in the collection of the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm, much of which was purchased from the former Buckingham and Hamilton collections (see Chapter Three p.166-74). It differs in the background details from the original and Peter Humfrey has suggested that its ‘disappointingly bland, uniform character’ means that ‘Titian left the picture to an assistant to complete’.³¹⁵ There is also a precise copy at Knoke, as well as a close copy (with minor variations) by Rubens [private collection] and a version at Ham House (see Chapter Three pp.162,177,198 and ills. 7, 8 & 9). A version of *Diana and Callisto* attributed to Rubens belonged to Charles I. Evidence of discrepancies in the sizes of figures indicates that versions of Titian’s *Venus and Adonis* now in the NG, the Getty and a private collection, although ostensibly sufficiently so close as to suggest the use of tracing, diversify from what is considered to be the original version in the Prado; this may reflect the retention of a “studio model”.³¹⁶ Philip II owned several studio variants of works by Titian alongside the originals, possibly because he was aware that they were never exactly the same; for example, two very similar paintings of the *Agony in the Garden* [Prado], which were both in the Escorial in 1574. Following the confiscation of the collection of Antonio Perez, Philip II owned two versions of the *Entombment* [Prado],

³¹¹ Bauer, L., ‘Van Dyck, replicas and tracing’, *BM*, 149, 2007, pp. 99-101; in the case of Velazquez nos. 4 and 5 in the 2006 exhibition (NG) seem likely to be the result of tracing.

³¹² *Tiziano*, exh. cat., Madrid, 2003, especially pp.77-91, 250, 261.

³¹³ *Ibid*, where numerous other examples of history painting are cited.

³¹⁴ Humfrey, P., *Titian*, 2007, p.198 (hereafter “2007a”).

³¹⁵ Humfrey 2007a, p.198.

³¹⁶ Penny, N., *National Gallery Catalogues: The Sixteenth Century Italian Paintings, II, Venice 1540-1600*, 2008, pp.274-291.

but they differ from one another in a number of ways (see Chapter Three pp.191, 210).³¹⁷ In the case of Caravaggio, the practice of tracing was unusually used to produce both variants and replicas, as noted by Keith Christiansen.³¹⁸

Tracing usually involved the use of oiled paper fixed to the surface of the original and then traced over, but as some copyists were uninhibited about applying pigments in oil to outline elements of the original work, this could be disastrous. As discussed by Mary Beal in her study of his notebooks, the soldier and antiquarian, Richard Symonds, described the procedure followed by the copyist Remigius van Leemput, then working in London: ‘he runs or drawes all the Grand lynes over with lake, making a crosse marke on his paper, and on the cloth where the picture is then rubbs his faire paper on the face & it takes off that lake & is a faire impression’.³¹⁹ A painting which was frequently traced by other artists is Titian’s *St. Peter Martyr* [formerly SS. Giovanni e Paolo, Venice, destroyed by fire in 1867, now replaced by a copy by Carlo Loth, 1691].³²⁰ A copy of it by Hieronymo Sánchez was commissioned by Philip II in 1577 [destroyed in a fire at the Escorial in 1671]. Symonds had previously noted the damage that tracing had inflicted on the altarpiece saying that it was ‘wast now of the freshness of the colours’.³²¹ As also noted by Beal, Giovanni Batista Volpato, probably writing in about 1670, strongly condemned the practice of tracing, making comments about this altarpiece which are generally similar to Symonds’ and adding that the viewer could no longer make out the figure of the martyred Dominican properly. Volpato’s text is structured as a dialogue between two artists, in which the older is presented as dispensing sensible advice to the younger. It is the older who states that those ‘sacrilegious blockheads’ who practised this form of copying should ‘have their hands cut off’, while ‘virtuosi do not make marks on pictures’, the latter remark seeming to imply that copying was permissible if done with care.³²² Those who intended to make traced copies were advised to rub the tracing paper well with bran so that ‘the archetype is not damaged’.³²³ Notoriously, Federico Barocci’s painting *The Entombment* [1582, S. Croce, Senigallia] was seriously damaged by copyists using a form of oiled

³¹⁷ Checa, F., *Tiziano y la monarquía hispánica: usos y funciones de la pintura veneciana en España (siglos XVI y XVII)*, Madrid, 1994.

³¹⁸ Christiansen, K., ‘Caravaggio’s second versions’, *BM*, 134, 1992, pp.502-3.

³¹⁹ Beal, op. cit., p.200.

³²⁰ Humfrey, P., *Titian: The Complete Paintings*, Bruges, 2007, cat. 86 (hereafter “2007b”).

³²¹ Beal, op. cit., p.200.

³²² Volpato: ‘Modo da Tener nel Dipinger’ in Merrifield, M.P., *Medieval and Renaissance Treatises on the Arts of Painting: Original Texts with English Translations* (reprint New York 1999), pp.734-52.

³²³ *The ‘Painter’s Manual’ of Dionysius of Fourna*, trans. P. Hetherington, Sagittarius Press, 1981, p.5.

tracing, which was already evident in 1588 when the artist sent his “giovane” to inspect it; it was later repaired by Barocci in 1606-8.³²⁴ According to Bellori, it was ‘constantly being copied’, but Barocci was able to repair it because he had ‘his original preparatory works’ in his studio.³²⁵ In 1596 a statute of the Accademia di S. Luca, Rome, imposed a fine on members for tracing, similar regulations being established in 1607 ‘because by so doing, both painters and canvases get damaged’.³²⁶ The existence of such regulations clearly indicates that this was common practice, but given the many proposals made at this institution which were not realised, it is not known if this was ever actually carried out.³²⁷ Volpato himself, notwithstanding the criticism cited above, was accused of replacing original works by Jacopo Bassano, in Bassano, with copies of his own making, although the method he may have used is not clear.³²⁸ Given that the Bassano family was an extremely productive family “firm”, and that it is not always easy to distinguish the works of individual members, this may have offered Volpato a fruitful opportunity for dishonesty.

Clearly, there is a great difference between the freehand copy and that involving some form of mechanical aid. The possibility that the tracing paper would move during the process of copying larger works was well known and presented difficulties to the copyist, which undoubtedly explains minor discrepancies in cases where it is obvious from overlays and infrared examination that tracing has taken place.³²⁹ Several instruments for tracing drawings have been identified, which include tracers ‘blunt tapered instrument...for use after blacklead was applied to the back of drawings to be copied; the outlines were then traced onto blank sheets of paper’.³³⁰ Symonds describes a similar process.³³¹ Tracing may result in the copyist tending to first lay in the outlines and then colour them in, a method which current scientific investigations make rather more obvious than they might have been at the time. Anxiety about how works of art would be treated probably inspired the Earl of Arundel, a great collector, to specify in his draft will of 1617 that ‘my desire is that all gentlemen of Vertue or Artistes w^{ch} are honest ment[sic] may allways be used wth curtesy & humanity when they shall come to see them [i.e. his ‘statues and

³²⁴ Bauer, L.F. ‘A letter by Barocci and the tracing of finished paintings’, *BM*, 128, pp.355-357.

³²⁵ Bellori, G.P., *The Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects, A New Translation and Critical Edition*, A.S. Wohl, H. Wohl, T. Montanari, Cambridge, paperback edition 2010, p.164.

³²⁶ Cavazzini, P., *Painting as Business in Early Seventeenth-Century Rome*, Pennsylvania, 2008, p.45.

³²⁷ Bauer op. cit.

³²⁸ Bauer op. cit.

³²⁹ see Christiansen 1992 op.cit.; *Tiziano*, 2003, nos. 41, 42, 47, 48.

³³⁰ Hambly, M., *Drawing Instruments 1580-1980*, 1988, p.127.

³³¹ Beal op. cit. p.199.

pictures' referred to earlier in the document]...& doe not hurt them wth theyre handling'.³³² (Arundel's collection is discussed in Chapter Three pp.155-158).

Related methods of copying included the *velo* in which a sheet of glass or a piece of silk or very sheer fabric (muslin or "tiffany" in England) on a frame was placed in front of the painting, in the latter case making use of white chalk on a dark colour; a framework of squares could be constructed to establish the co-ordinates.³³³ Alberti claimed to have invented this "veil".³³⁴ Such a device was later recorded in Peter Lely's London studio.³³⁵ When this method was used for frescoes, the cloth would have to be attached with "little nails" and would have to be placed directly on the surface of the fresco and this was potentially damaging. As a consequence, when copies were made in the Vatican by French painters for use at the Gobelins tapestry factory, this method gave rise to considerable criticism.³³⁶ According to Baldinucci, a mirror could also be employed to reduce the scale of the original.³³⁷ Symonds noted and drew 'a frame to draw pictures bigger than the original designe by. Scrues in every corner whereby it moves', which he saw in the house of Paolo Ruggieri, a close friend of the painter Giovanni Angelo Canini, who frequently acted as Symonds' guide in Rome in 1650 (see below pp.134-5).³³⁸ This sounds like a pantograph, intended for enlarging and reducing drawings, which is said to have been invented around 1603 by the Jesuit Christoph Scheiner, who published this in 1631 and Pepys then saw one in London in December 1668.³³⁹

Other methods include using goatskins scraped thin and oiled, or parchment, the reuse of a cartoon, making a cartoon from an existing cartoon or existing painting and then making a painted copy and the use of a *graticola* (net).³⁴⁰ As Beal has discussed, Symonds also mentions this device, when he saw a student copying one of Giulio Romano's frescoes in the Sala di Constantino, Vatican Palace.³⁴¹ The use of goatskin/parchment may be

³³² Newman, J., 'A draft Will of the Earl of Arundel', *BM*, 122, 1980, pp.692-696.

³³³ Bauer op. cit.; Bambach op. cit. p.127.

³³⁴ Bolland, A., 'From the Workshop to the Academy: The Emergence of the Artist' in *Renaissance Florence: A Social History*, eds. R.J. Crum and J.T. Paoletti, Cambridge, 2006, pp.454-478.

³³⁵ Talley, M.K., *Portrait Painting in England: Studies in the Technical Literature before 1700*, Guildford, 1981.

³³⁶ Wood, J. 'Raphael Copies and Exemplary Picture Galleries in Mid Eighteenth-Century London', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 62 Bd., H.3, 1999, pp. 394-417, 411.

³³⁷ Bauer op. cit.

³³⁸ Brookes, 2007, p.107.

³³⁹ Hambly op. cit., p.130.

³⁴⁰ Meder, J., *The Mastery of Drawing*, translated and revised by W. Ames, 2.v., New York, 1978, pp.397-9.

³⁴¹ Beal op. cit., p.201.

indicated by the object in the foreground of the self-portrait by Antonio Cioci [1789, Uffizi].³⁴²

The re-use of existing cartoons within the same painting is clearly evident in Piero della Francesca's *Madonna del Parto* [Monterchi] and the Pollaiuolo brothers *Martyrdom of S. Sebastian* [National Gallery]; in both these cases, a cartoon has been reversed to produce a figure in the opposite orientation and this continued to be done in the seventeenth century. Presumably, Perugino followed the same practice when he produced his much-criticised *Assumption* [Florence, SS. Annunziata], with figures and poses which are extremely close to his *Ascension* [Musée des Beaux-Arts, Lyons], but no cartoons survive.³⁴³ Replication of certain figures might be prompted by the expense of using live models, which was referred to by Bernini and complained about by Artemisia Gentileschi.³⁴⁴ It is also possible that cartoons, or secondary cartoons made from the original cartoon, were shared between several workshops.³⁴⁵ Megan Holmes has explored this practice in the case of the "Lippi and Pesellino Imitator", where there appears to have been a close connection between the copyist and the original workshop.³⁴⁶

Genre painters were even more likely to repeat their own images, as in the case of the still life painter Tommaso Salini, whose death inventory included 'a large number of *lucidi*'.³⁴⁷ Antonio Mini in writing to Michelangelo in 1532, indicated that it was his intention to have copies made from Leonardo's cartoon of *Leda*, which had been given to him when Leonardo departed for France.³⁴⁸ On rare occasions, a print could be turned into an oil painting with a suitable support and the application of colour.³⁴⁹ It has been suggested that "precise replication" of complete paintings became more common in the sixteenth century than it had been in the fifteenth century, other than in the case of cult images (see below), although in Florence the Medici might grant the favour of a replica of a painting which they

³⁴² *Artists' Self-Portraits from the Uffizi*, exh. cat. Dulwich Picture Gallery 2007, no. 23, although it is not identified as such in the catalogue entry.

³⁴³ This is also discussed by O'Malley, M., 'Quality, Demand, and the Pressures of Reputation: Rethinking Perugino', *AB*, 89, December 2007, pp.674-693.

³⁴⁴ Spear, 2003, p. 314.

³⁴⁵ Holmes, *Artistic Exchange*, p. 39.

³⁴⁶ Holmes, *Artistic Exchange*, p.41.

³⁴⁷ Cavazzini, 2008, p.32.

³⁴⁸ Bambach, op. cit., pp. 87, 91.

³⁴⁹ Van den Brink, P., 'The Art of Copying: copying and serial production of paintings in the Low Countries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries' in *Brueghel Enterprises*, ed. P. van den Brink, Ghent 2001, pp.12-43.

owned, under strictly controlled conditions.³⁵⁰ Such mechanical methods were criticised for making artists lazy by both Anton Francesco Doni, in the late sixteenth century, and Antonio Palomino, writing in the early eighteenth century, whereas previously Ghirlandaio's ability to draw freehand had been particularly admired by Vasari.³⁵¹

Methodological copying thus drew criticism sometimes for physical damage to the original, but it also inspired new technical means of reproducing the image that were in themselves ways of displaying artists' ingenuity and skills of improvisation. This is not to say that copying was unambiguously commended, and it is to the issue of criticism that this argument will now turn.

Critics and Commentators on copies in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, it was common for artists to be asked to make new paintings which were similar to existing works of art. Examples of this include the altarpiece [Museo di San Marco] by Fra Bartolomeo begun in 1510 for the Sala del Gran Consiglio, Palazzo Vecchio, Florence, where he was required to 'follow the designs stipulated in the agreement with Filippino [Lippi]'. Lippi's death in 1504 meant he had not completed the work.³⁵² In St. Peter's, Rome, in 1627-8 Lanfranco's *Christ Summoning Peter to Walk on the Water* deliberately quotes from Giotto's much-earlier *Navicella* in the same church in its composition and in Angelo Caroselli's *St. Wenceslas* 1627-30 [now Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna] the artist was specifically commissioned to model his composition on the previous example from the old basilica (for Caroselli, see below pp.124-5).³⁵³ Several sixteenth-century commentators remarked that it was advisable to keep to well-known models and not to confuse the viewer unnecessarily; these include Giovanni Battista Adriani, Giovanni Andrea Gilio and Raffaele Borghini.³⁵⁴

Comments made about copying, rather than about the methods used, vary enormously during this period. Artists are often negative, which may be a reflection of their fears

³⁵⁰ Holmes, *Artistic Exchange*, p.46.

³⁵¹ Bambach, pp.131,132.

³⁵² *Fra Bartolommeo, Master Draughtsman of the High Renaissance*, exh. cat., Rotterdam, 1990, p.219.

Political events prevented Fra Bartolommeo from completing it.

³⁵³ Rice, L., *The Altars and Altarpieces of New St. Peter's: Outfitting the Basilica 1621-1666*, Cambridge, 1997, pp.252-6, 239.

³⁵⁴ Günther, H., 'Michelangelo's Works in the Eyes of his Contemporaries' in *The Beholder: The Experience of Art in Early Modern Europe*, eds. T. Frangenburg and R. Williams, 2006, pp.69-73.

about having their reputation sullied and their income depleted, despite which many of them were willing to undertake copying in specific circumstances (see below). The ability to imitate successfully the manner of a master of a previous era, absorbing the best elements, but still developing one's own style, could be beneficial, whereas closely replicating a near contemporary could give rise to severe criticism. Thus, Barocci, much admired by other artists despite his relative isolation in Urbino, was noted approvingly by contemporaries as a "grandissimo imitatore" of Titian; he adopted Titian's manner of painting, rather than making direct copies, and it was said that this made him "more famous".³⁵⁵ Barocci also clearly studied Raphael closely and emulated some of his paintings, but the results are usually variants, such as in the case of Raphael's very influential altarpiece *The Madonna di Foligno* [Vatican].³⁵⁶ The stated goal of such emulation was to improve upon one's models, in such a way that "it is scarcely perceived and...only apparent to the learned". If done with care this could enhance the reputation of the artist undertaking such emulation.³⁵⁷

The imitation of a single master, rather than several different ones, was recommended by Cennino Cennini in the early fifteenth century, who was concerned that instead of one great master, a variety would merely result in stylistic confusion for the student.³⁵⁸ As Vasari would also recommend, Cennino extols the value of imitating nature. Debates regarding imitation can be seen in Vasari's *Lives* and have their origins in literary debates regarding the merits of imitating a single ancient author, such as either Cicero or Virgil, or several different ones.³⁵⁹ Vasari's comments on direct copies of paintings are often full of admiration, but he had reservations about slavish imitation of another artist's manner, which he felt could have a very negative effect, while making a careful selection 'from all their best qualities' as Raphael did to create 'a style uniquely his own', was praiseworthy. Cropper in her discussion of painterly invention believes that this 'permanently alter[ed] the condition in which later artists, including the Carracci, worked'.³⁶⁰ One instance in which

³⁵⁵ Fontana, J., 'Duke Guidobaldo II della Rovere, Federico Barocci and the Taste for Titian at the Court of Urbino' in *Patronage and Dynasty: The Rise of the Della Rovere in Renaissance Italy*, ed. I.F. Verstegen, Kirksville, Missouri, 2007, pp. 161-178.

³⁵⁶ Barocci's variant is lost, but known from a sketch and a preparatory study: Fontana, J. 'Federico Barocci's Emulation of Raphael in the Fossombrone Madonna & Child with Saints' in *Coming About...A Festschrift for John Shearman*, Cambridge, Mass., 2001, eds., L.R. Jones and L.C. Matthew, pp. 183-190.

³⁵⁷ Ibid., quoting Landino writing in 1473.

³⁵⁸ Cennino d'Andrea Cennini, *The Craftsman's Handbook* trans. D.V. Thompson Jr., New York, 1960, pp.14-16; Kemp, M., 'Equal excellences': Lomazzo and the explanation of individual style in the visual arts', *Renaissance Studies*, 1, 1987, pp. 1-26, 3.

³⁵⁹ This is discussed in greater detail by Gregory, S., 'The Unsympathetic Exemplar in Vasari's Life of Pontormo', *Renaissance Studies*, 22, 2008, pp.1-32.

³⁶⁰ Cropper, 2005, p.106.

Vasari expresses his disapproval of imitation in the life of Pontormo, where he clearly felt that bad things had resulted from that artist being influenced too greatly by Dürer's prints.³⁶¹ Vasari expressed the view that 'our art is all imitation, of nature for the most part, and then, because a man cannot by himself rise so high, of those works that are executed by those whom he judges to be better masters than himself'.³⁶²

There is a famous case mentioned by Vasari, which involved the substitution of a copy by Andrea del Sarto [Naples, Capodimonte – type B] for Raphael's original portrait of *Pope Leo X and Two Cardinals* [Uffizi]. According to Vasari on the basis of his personal observation, Pope Clement VII agreed to the request of Duke Federigo Gonzaga for the original, but Ottaviano de' Medici wished to retain this family portrait in Florence and therefore commissioned a copy from del Sarto in secret. In fact, this was almost certainly paid for by Clement himself.³⁶³ Raphael did not have the sort of large workshop in Florence that he was to establish subsequently in Rome and therefore the choice of copyist would have been less obvious, as members of workshop would have been taught to imitate his style precisely and consequently would have been able to produce a convincing replica. This is an interesting example of an established master, who was not a member of the original artist's workshop, acting as copyist and very probably priding himself on his ability to produce a thoroughly convincing work; the copy remained unnoticed by everyone, until Vasari himself had the satisfaction of pointing out to Raphael's former pupil, Giulio Romano, in Mantua that this was a substitution. Giulio is quoted by Vasari as valuing the work 'even more [than the original] for it is something out of the course of nature that a man of excellence should imitate the manner of another so well, and should make a copy so like', thus underlining the point of view of an artist, who is likely to perceive the skill involved (and paying a posthumous compliment to Giulio's generosity of spirit). There was no question of a purchaser having paid the price of an original, but only of someone receiving an "inferior" work, in this case as a gift. No doubt the duke of Mantua was attracted not only by the fame of the sitters, one of whom was the future Clement VII, but also by the fame of the original artist, making this an unusual case. By the time Vasari published this tale which redounds so much to his own credit, all of the principal protagonists were dead, which gave him more freedom in what he was able to say about

³⁶¹ Gregory op. cit.

³⁶² Vasari *Lives*, I, p.32.

³⁶³ *Tiziano e il ritratto di corte da Raffaello ai carracci*, exh. cat. Naples, 2006, no. C2. Shearman 2003, pp.783-4.

it.³⁶⁴ By 1580 this painting had been given away, which may reflect the impact of Vasari's published revelation and it is recorded in the 1653 inventory of Palazzo Farnese, Rome, though anonymously and not as a copy.³⁶⁵ It should be noted that Vasari himself recalled being required by Ottaviano de Medici to make a copy.³⁶⁶

Twenty years later Duke Vincenzo I Gonzaga's chancellor refused a group of copies which had been offered to his employer on the grounds that "your Highness...desires originals by good hands", which seems to the present writer to be at odds with the copies, mainly after Raphael, the same Duke sent as a diplomatic gift to Spain with Rubens in 1603.³⁶⁷ The presence in the Gonzaga collection of small copies by Ludovico Dondi of Mantegna's *Triumphs of Caesar* dated 1602 should also be noted [copies in Munich, Alte Pinakothek, originals Hampton Court].³⁶⁸

Vasari's *Lives* was known to connoisseurs in England and most of the Mantuan collection subsequently came to England after its purchase by Charles I, making this tale particularly relevant. Although del Sarto's copy had already left Mantua, a version of the Raphael portrait was acquired in London by the Spanish ambassador, Cárdenas, after the execution of Charles I, however, upon its arrival in Spain it was correctly identified as not being the original by Velazquez [now attributed to Giulio Bugiardini, Palazzo Barberini].³⁶⁹ In 1716 a version of del Sarto's copy of the Raphael was purchased by the duke of Chandos, whose correspondence reveals his concern that he was getting 'the same copy which Andrea made'.³⁷⁰ Almost 200 years after its making the copy had therefore achieved a famous reputation in its own right and its provenance was the subject of enquiry to ensure that it was the only copy. Chandos stated that: 'ye Copy after Raphael...by so eminent an hand is equal to an Original'.³⁷¹ Chandos also owned reduced-scale copies of Raphael's tapestry cartoons by Joseph Goupy, who 'specialised in pastel and gouache copies of Old

³⁶⁴ Vasari, *Lives*, II, pp.843-4.

³⁶⁵ Shearman, 2003, p.784. Bertini, G., *La galleria del Duca di Parma: Storia di una Collezione*, Milan, 1987, no. 151.

³⁶⁶ Vasari, G., *Il Libro delle Ricordanze*, ed. A. del Vita, Arezzo, 1938, pp.34-5.

³⁶⁷ Spear, R.E., *The Divine Guido: Religion, Sex, Money and Art in the World of Guido Reni*, 1997, p.267.

³⁶⁸ *Gonzaga: La Celeste Galeria, le raccolte*, exh. cat. Mantua, 2002, cat. 42.

³⁶⁹ *The Sale of the Century: Artistic Relations between Spain and Great Britain, 1604-1655*, eds. J. Brown and J. Elliott, 2002, p.67.

³⁷⁰ Jonckheere, K., 'Supply and Demand: Some Notes on the Economy of Seventeenth-Century Connoisseurship' in *Art Market and Connoisseurship: A Closer Look at Paintings by Rembrandt, Rubens and their Contemporaries*, eds. A. Tummars and K. Jonckheere, Amsterdam, 2008, pp. 69-96, 88.

³⁷¹ Jenkins, S., Chandos 2007, p.128.

Masters'.³⁷² However, although this is not discussed by either Susan Jenkins or Koenraad Jonckheere in their studies of his acquisitions, Chandos did not acquire the "original" copy of Raphael's portrait, which is generally accepted to be that now at Capodimonte [formerly at Palazzo Farnese]. The present whereabouts of the Chandos version are unknown.³⁷³

Raphael himself went to considerable trouble to control replication of his work, partly through his collaboration with Marcantonio Raimondi in the field of reproductive prints. When Raphael agreed to supply the cartoon for the *St. Michael* to Duke Alfonso I d'Este, he specified that it was not to be used by another artist to produce another version of his painting, as is made clear by a letter from the Duke.³⁷⁴ The original painting, which had been sent as a diplomatic gift to François I, is now in the Louvre. Raphael's renown as an artist was inevitably consolidated by his premature death and references to copies of his works abound. Raphael's *Madonna del divino amore*, [now in Naples] which was owned by Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, was particularly popular with those desiring copies, closely followed by his *St. John the Baptist* [Pitti, Florence] (see below). In the sixteenth century both Guidobaldo II della Rovere and Francesco Maria II della Rovere owned several copies of works by Raphael. Replicas of replicas were not unusual, so that in July 1582, Duke Francesco Maria's correspondent in Rome queried whether or not he would wish to have a copy of the copy owned by Monsignor del Monte of the Farnese Raphael, but seemed inclined to think not.³⁷⁵ Guido Reni took a copy [possibly that now in S. Luigi dei Francesi, Rome, but it is in poor condition] of Raphael's *S. Cecilia* [formerly S. Giovanni in Monte, Bologna where it is replaced by a copy, now Pinacoteca Nazionale] to Rome with him when he moved there early in the C17th, always crediting Raphael 'in large measure for his advancement'.³⁷⁶ According to Bellori, this copy had been ordered by Cardinal Sfrondati. The suggestion that Reni used this copy 'to deal with the minute archaeology of the early Christian taste' is unconvincing as the explanation for its presence there.³⁷⁷ It is more likely that he found it inspiring in a more general sense, as he worked under the supervision of Cesare Baronio on the frescoes of the martyrdom of S. Cecilia

³⁷² *Handel: A Celebration of his Life and Times 1685-1759*, exh. cat., NPG, 1985, cat. 91.

³⁷³ Jenkins, S. 'An Inventory of His Grace The Duke of Chandos's Seat Att Cannons Taken June the 19TH 1725' by John Gilbert, *Walpole Society*, 67, 2005, 93-192; Shearman, J., *Andrea del Sarto*, 2v., Oxford, 1965, pp.265-267.

³⁷⁴ Pon, L., *Raphael, Durer, and Marcantonio Raimondi*, 2004; Shearman, *Raphael*, pp.373-4.

³⁷⁵ Shearman, *Raphael*, pp.1295-6. Copies of copies are also noted by De Marchi & Van Miegroet, 1996, p.37.

³⁷⁶ Bellori p. 351.

³⁷⁷ Spear 1997 p.53.

following the re-discovery of the saint's miraculously preserved body in Rome in 1599, at a time of special emphasis on the martyrs of the early Church, in a very different atmosphere from that prevailing at the time when Raphael's painting was originally produced. The post-mortem inventory of the possessions of the painter Francesco Villamena taken in 1625 reveals only one copy: 'Una Copia d'una S. Cecilia di Raffaello, l'originale è in Bologna, mano del Procaccino'.³⁷⁸ No such painting by Procaccino has been traced, but there were many versions of the original Raphael.³⁷⁹

Raphael's Madonnas were particularly popular, with several copies of the painting that came to be known in the seventeenth century as *La Perla* (because Philip IV regarded it as the "pearl" of his collection, after its acquisition from the sale which followed the execution of Charles I (henceforth: "*Sale*"), being recorded by artists such as Taddeo Zuccaro and Veronese, among others. Vasari in 1557 and 1560 was paid only 45 and 10 scudi respectively for copying Madonnas by Raphael; these are not identified in the documents.³⁸⁰ A 'portrait of a young woman, which had been dismissed as a fake Raphael...has been confirmed as genuine...and could be worth up to £25 million' was reported in an article of May, 2010, which goes on to acknowledge that this may have been finished by Giulio Romano from an idea by Raphael and closely resembles the head of the Madonna in *La Perla*.³⁸¹ Although not discussed in the report, this essentially means that this is not a portrait but another case in which a single figure has been extracted from a larger composition for repetition (Appendix IV, type J).

Occasionally, the appearance of a copy by another artist could also have unexpected consequences: the installation of a signed variant of Michelangelo's *Pietà* made by Nanni di Baccio Bigio in Santo Spirito, Florence, in March 1549 led to an anonymous denunciation of Michelangelo as someone who was the 'inventor of filth who puts his faith in art rather than devotion'.³⁸² These harsh comments were sparked partly by Nanni's version itself and partly by the original sculpture by Michelangelo. The copy of the *Pietà* placed in the Riccio family chapel in Santo Spirito is a variant mainly in the details, rather

³⁷⁸ Trinchieri Camiz, F., 'The Roman 'studio' of Francesco Villamena', *BM*, 136, 1994, pp.507-516, no. 48.

³⁷⁹ *L'Estasi di Santa Cecilia di Raffaello da Urbino nella Pinacoteca nazionale di Bologna*, exh. cat., Bologna, 1983.

³⁸⁰ Shearman, *Raphael* pp.1059, 1088, 1272.

³⁸¹ Daily Telegraph, 8.5.10.

³⁸² Waldman, L.A., 'Nanni di Baccio Bigio at Santo Spirito', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorisches Institutes in Florenz*, 42, 1998, pp.198-204. This was the first publication of the full text of the anonymous criticism.

than in the principal aspects of the sculpture and it has been suggested that this was commissioned by Luigi del Riccio ‘as a solemn testimony of his friendship with the great master’ (Michelangelo). Ironically, Nanni, the sculptor of the copy, became the ‘scourge of Michelangelo’s late years’ and was determined to replace Michelangelo as the architect of St Peter’s.³⁸³ The anonymous critic’s words reveal that he is giving equal moral value to the copy and to the original, referring to all modern artists as imitators of similar ‘Lutheran caprices’ and hoping that God would destroy such idolatrous images.³⁸⁴ This was not the only version of the *Pietà* in Italy, since Nanni had also previously completed one in Santa Maria dell’Anima, Rome, (1532), which like the later Florentine version, deviates from the original.³⁸⁵ Looking further afield, in 1546 François I sent Primaticcio to Rome with a letter for Michelangelo, in which he sought a cast of the *Pietà* ‘so that I may adorn one of my chapels’.³⁸⁶ Presumably, he had no anxiety that the image might be considered unsuitable for such a location, nor was there any proposal to remove the original from St. Peter’s for such reasons, although it did change its location within the new church several times in the early seventeenth century.

The criticisms made of Michelangelo in 1549 were also an oblique reference to a completely different work in another medium, that is the storm of criticism which had erupted over the fresco painting of the *Last Judgement* in the Sistine Chapel, a work which was generally considered to be extremely difficult to copy. Fortunately, nearly contemporary reduced copies of the *Last Judgement* do exist, such as that by Daniele da Volterra [Naples, Capodimonte] and one attributed by its owner to “Francesco Daddi” [private collection, Florence], which allow the modern viewer to appreciate Michelangelo’s original intentions with respect to the nude figures which caused such great controversy that many were given “clothes” very soon after he had completed the painting and consideration was even given to demolishing the entire fresco in the reign of Pope Paul IV Carafa (1555-59).³⁸⁷ A reduced fresco copy painted in 1584 by Giovan Domenico Pezzi in the parish church in Carona (near Lugano) follows the original faithfully in many respects, most importantly in showing most of the figures nude as Michelangelo originally

³⁸³ Riccio had died in 1546; Wittkower, R., ‘Nanni di Baccio Bigio and Michelangelo’ in *Festschrift Ulrich Middeldorf*, eds. A. Kosegarten and P. Tigler, 2v., Berlin, 1968, pp. 248-262.

³⁸⁴ Wittkower, op. cit., Waldman 1998 op. cit.

³⁸⁵ The original commission was given to Lorenzetto in 1530. This copy is not fully discussed by Hughes, A., ‘Authority, Authenticity and Aura: Walter Benjamin and the Case of Michelangelo’ in *Sculpture and its Reproductions*, op. cit., pp.29-45.

³⁸⁶ Hughes, p. 39.

³⁸⁷ Hall, M.B., Introduction to *Michelangelo’s Last Judgment*, ed. M.B. Hall, Cambridge, 2005, p.34.

intended.³⁸⁸ Prints after the fresco circulated widely, permitting many to criticize a work they could not have seen personally, the prime example being Pietro Aretino, who wrote a series of letters, culminating in the argument that ‘Michelangelo [had] deliberately violated the boundaries of decorum...in privileging his art over sacred truth’.³⁸⁹ A private letter in 1545 to Vasari referred to ‘a thousand heresies’ in reference to the Last Judgement.³⁹⁰ The disgust felt by conservatives could thus lead even Florentines to disparage Florence’s most famous son, whose reputation had previously been a source of pride.

There was a well-established trope, frequently repeated, regarding illicit substitution of copies for originals. This is, for instance, told of the fifteenth-century Neapolitan painter Colantonio, copying Netherlandish paintings and of the seventeenth-century copyist, Michael Cross (fl.1633-60) substituting his own work for that of Raphael in Venice.³⁹¹ In the case of the former, Colantonio himself revealed the deception, whereas in the latter, only Cross’s departure from the city is said to have prevented his arrest. It is not clear which work by Raphael Cross was copying and there is no information to place Cross in Venice at any time, however, the patchy surviving records of this artist do not permit any degree of certainty. The Venetian writer Marcantonio Michiel, who kept extensive notes on the paintings he saw in his native city, recorded a *St. Margaret* by Raphael in the collection of his brother-in-law, Giovantonio Venier, in 1528, which then passed into the Priuli collection and was sold in 1638.³⁹² This is said in a number of sources to have been in the collection of Charles I, but was in fact purchased by the 3rd Marquess of Hamilton (all references to “Hamilton” mean 3rd Marquess only).³⁹³ It subsequently passed into the collection of Archduke Leopold Wilhelm [Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna] and can be seen in Teniers’ representations of that collection (see below pp.140-141); it is now considered by a number of scholars to be a workshop piece. There is a copy in the Capella Priuli, S. Michele in Isola, Venice, which may be the replacement made for the family

³⁸⁸ Chioyenda, L.P.C., ‘Una copia ad affresco inedita del Giudizio di Michelangelo’, *Palatino*, VIII, 1964, pp.149-151.

³⁸⁹ Schlitt, M., ‘Painting, Criticism, and Michelangelo’s Last Judgment’ in *Michelangelo’s Last Judgment*, op. cit., pp.113-149, 129.

³⁹⁰ Schlitt, op. cit., p.125.

³⁹¹ Nicolini, F., *L’art napoletano del Rinascimento e la lettera di Pietro Summonte*, Naples, 1925, pp.160-1; Vertue Note Books II, *Walpole Society*, XX, 1931-2, pp.146-7; Brewer notes a similar story regarding the disputed “Leonardo” and its substitution by an anonymous copy, sometime in the late C18th or mid C19th, as well as the rumour that the *Mona Lisa* is not the original, op. cit. pp.99,141.

³⁹² Shearman, *Raphael*, pp.844-846.

³⁹³ Meyer zur Capellen, J., *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of his Paintings, II: The Roman Religious Paintings ca. 1508-20*, Landshut, 2005, pp.271-4, cat. A15; Shakeshaft, 1986, pp.114-134; Garas, K., ‘Die Entstehung der Galerie des Erzherzogs Leopold Wilhelm’, *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlung in Wien*, 63, 1967, pp. 39-80 (“1967b”), p.70.

when they sold most of their collection to Hamilton (see Chapter Three pp.166-174); the copyist is not recorded, but this could be the source of the legend about Michael Cross. There were other works by Raphael in the city: in 1581, Francesco Sansovino's account of the celebrations following the victory at Lepanto in 1571 records the public display of famous paintings at the Rialto, including a work (or works) by Raphael, but he does not give the subject matter.³⁹⁴ George Vertue's account of the incident involving Cross, written about a century later, refers to a 'fam'd Madonna... in St. Mark's', but this painting has not been identified.³⁹⁵

In the cases of Colantonio and Cross no financial transaction was directly involved, as these were substitutions for originals; however, it is possible that the original work, having been removed from its intended location, could then have been sold for a substantial sum, although it is difficult to see how this could have been done without attracting attention in the case of a well-known altarpiece. Colantonio's speciality seems to have been in copying Flemish artists so closely that his own hand could not be detected. Cross is best known as the copyist employed by Charles I to copy unobtainable works by Titian (see Chapter Three p.185). Elizabeth Cropper has stated that not only had Cardinal Benedetto Giustiniani secretly replaced the original altarpiece by Francia in S. Maria della Misericordia, Bologna, with a copy, but that this was not a unique event.³⁹⁶

All the instances cited above suggest anxieties about the boundaries between original and copy and some fears as if artists might be seeking to deceive. Some artists, however, deliberately sought to rival others as a tribute to their predecessors' work.

Emulation and copies

Emulation is distinguished from copying by the fact that it expresses admiration for artistic exemplars without precisely replicating their work. Implicit within this is the possibility of surpassing the artist whose masterpiece was being emulated, although hubris might be detected in young artists claiming that their work could exceed in excellence that of their great predecessors. Benjamin perceived 'mode[s] of perception' as being 'buried' beneath

³⁹⁴ Shearman, *Raphael* p.1295.

³⁹⁵ Vertue, op. cit., p.147.

³⁹⁶ Cropper, E., review of 'Caravaggio and the Giustiniani', *BM*, 143, 2001, pp.449-452, 450.

‘the weight of the classical tradition’ and that this needed to be resisted. Pierre Bourdieu, citing Marcel Duchamp, pointed out that ‘*returns* to past styles have never been more frequent than in these times of frenetic pursuit of originality’.³⁹⁷ He also opined that ‘the readability of a contemporary work varies primarily according to the relationship which the creators maintain...with the code of the previous period’.³⁹⁸ This links with the practice of emulation during the period under discussion. Bourdieu went on to point out the ways in which this became self-defeating in the tightly-controlled *École* in the nineteenth century. ‘Avant-garde artists...must inevitably situate themselves in relation to all the preceding attempts at surpassing which have occurred in the history of the field’.³⁹⁹ This may also be applied to the period under discussion here.

In the late sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, subtle evidence of emulation, rather than direct copying, was often admired by contemporaries, as in the case of Barocci emulating Titian cited above. Inevitably, viewers brought their own subjective perceptions of emulation to bear and, consequently, reactions varied widely. The issue of emulation and copying is especially interesting when associated with those artists whose work has been discussed in terms of their derivation of ideas and copying of motifs from a variety of sources and styles. Debate has raged about the extent to which the Carracci were innovators or merely eclectic and relatively uneducated artists. In their respect for the masters of the High Renaissance and emulation of them, they can be perceived as reformers of the debased form of Mannerism which prevailed at the end of the sixteenth century.

An example of emulation is provided by Annibale Carracci’s *Venus and Adonis* [c. 1588-90, Prado], which was the subject of an exhibition in 2005. Until 1971 this painting had been considered to be the replica of the version in Vienna [Kunsthistorisches Museum, formerly at Schloss Ambras]; cleaning and restoration for the exhibition underlined the autograph status of the Prado version, which had previously been little discussed in the literature. This painting shows Annibale Carracci at his most “Venetian”, with clear references to Titian and Veronese, as well as to Correggio, the latter being noted by Padre Resta in his marginalia to Baglione, when he saw it in the Serra collection in Milan. The Venetian aspect of the painting was recorded in the seventeenth century when it was said to

³⁹⁷ Bourdieu, P., *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*, ed. R. Johnson, Cambridge, 1993, p.109.

³⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, p.225.

³⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p.243,265-6.

be: ‘fatta da lui ad emulazione di quella di Tiziano’.⁴⁰⁰ The original owner of the painting has not been identified. After its acquisition for the Spanish royal collection a copy was requested by the Earl of Sandwich in 1666, who wished to have 13 paintings in that collection copied and this was approved, but it is not known if this copy of the Carracci was executed.⁴⁰¹

The Carracci also continued to train their pupils by the usual methods, but learning by copying the master might have unexpected consequences. In 1624, Giovanni Lanfranco accused Domenichino of plagiarising his master Agostino Carracci. The paintings in question are Agostino’s *Last Communion of St. Jerome*, c. 1589, for the Certosa outside Bologna, [now Pinacoteca Nazionale; see ill. 6] and Domenichino’s painting of the same subject for the Roman church S. Girolamo della Carità 1614, [where it is replaced by a copy by Antonio Corsi (1797), original now Vatican; see ill. 7]. These two paintings could never have been seen together in the seventeenth century, as they were not in the same city. Lanfranco’s accusation was made ten years after the unveiling of Domenichino’s painting, in the context of their rivalry over fresco decorations at S. Andrea della Valle. This dispute was notably acrimonious and later involved an unsuccessful attempt by Domenichino to murder Lanfranco.

In support of his accusation of plagiarism, Lanfranco caused a print of the painting to be made, which inevitably reverses Domenichino’s composition. Writing fifty years later, Bellori said that Lanfranco ‘could find no other criticism to make [and so] condemned it for plagiarism...because of his very great rivalry with Domenico’ and went on to enumerate the ways in which the two paintings are different.⁴⁰² In Bellori’s opinion, it was ‘laudable imitation’, while acknowledging that Domenichino, whom he knew well, had borrowed from Agostino on other occasions. Carlo Cesare Malvasia, the Bolognese writer on painting and admirer of Agostino Carracci, also writing long after the event, said: ‘what painter does not steal in some way?’, but that by making minor changes ‘judiciously hid[es] the theft’.⁴⁰³ In fact, Domenichino did not copy Carracci, although he certainly borrowed

⁴⁰⁰ Posner, D., *Annibale Carracci: A study in the reform of Italian painting around 1590*, 1971, 2v., II, cat. 46.

⁴⁰¹ *Annibale Carracci’s Venus, Adonis and Cupid*, exh. cat. Prado, 2005. Malcolm, A., ‘Arte, diplomacia y política de la corte durante las embajadas del conde de Sandwich a Madrid y Lisboa (1660-1668)’, in *Arte y Diplomacia de la Monarquía Hispánica en el Siglo XVII* ed. J.L. Colomer, Madrid 2003, pp.161-175.

⁴⁰² Bellori p.248.

⁴⁰³ Quoted in Cropper, 2005, p. 96.

numerous elements. A key difference is that Domenichino's composition is oriented in the opposite direction, which makes Lanfranco's use of a reverse print both particularly telling and less than honest. Photography permits modern viewers to see these paintings simultaneously and see the many differences between them and perhaps to draw the conclusion that Domenichino made some improvements upon the original, but this was impossible in the 1620s and therefore the print could play a disproportionately important role. Similar tactics had already been employed to discredit Il Cigoli's altarpiece of *St. Peter Healing* [1607, formerly St. Peter's Rome, destroyed], where his rivals accused him of using a foreign print as his source material.⁴⁰⁴ In order to make their case, they seem to have forged the print. Ironically, Cigoli's altarpiece is only known now from reproductive prints and surviving drawings.⁴⁰⁵ Poussin certainly felt that Domenichino's painting was to be preferred to Agostino's and borrowed some of the figures for his *Confirmation*. According to Bellori, Poussin believed that 'novelty in painting consist[s] in good and novel arrangement and expression', as an example of which he cited the Domenichino, versus Agostino's painting.⁴⁰⁶ Monsignor Giovanni Battista Agucchi, the author of a Treatise on painting, wrote a letter in admiration of Domenichino, saying that he would become even more famous, as he deserved, 'once he is dead: given that even while alive he has the glory of seeing all day long his beautiful painting of St. Jerome being copied'.⁴⁰⁷ The practice of copying was therefore perceived by some as beneficial in spreading the fame of the maker of the original, but only if the right exemplars were followed. Cropper makes the interesting point that it was easier for Lanfranco to make the accusation precisely because it was so hard for Domenichino to disprove it, given the relative inaccessibility of Agostino's altarpiece in the Certosa outside Bologna.⁴⁰⁸ Bellori implied that Poussin had chosen the right exemplar by studying Domenichino, rather than Lanfranco, whose work in S. Gregorio, Rome, was more popular with other young artists.⁴⁰⁹ Bellori also mentioned with approval Poussin's imitation of a print after Raphael, whose reputation was already that of the artist whose style should be chosen for emulation.⁴¹⁰ The principal period in

⁴⁰⁴ Spear, 2004, p.17.

⁴⁰⁵ Cropper 2005 pp.131-135.

⁴⁰⁶ Bellori, p. 339. Verdi, R., *Nicolas Poussin*, exh. cat. Royal Academy of Arts, London 1995, no.43.

⁴⁰⁷ Bellori, p.20. Agucchi's treatise survived as a fragment, which was published as part of the preface to a collection of prints after Annibale Carracci: *Diverse Figure al numero di ottanta*, Rome, 1646.

⁴⁰⁸ Cropper 2005, p.155.

⁴⁰⁹ Bellori p. 312.

⁴¹⁰ Bellori p. 313.

which the comments circulated most widely was in the last quarter of the seventeenth century and therefore many of the debates lie outside the scope of this thesis.⁴¹¹

It has been demonstrated that in the 1650s and 1660s most commentators in Rome believed that there had been a decline in artistic standards and that too many artists were following the example of Caravaggio ‘as filth and deformities were sought after...assiduously’.⁴¹² Raphael’s importance as the artist who should be imitated would continue to grow.

A *Pietà* by Domenichino [Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York] dated 1603 (Appendix IV, type I), clearly reproduces a large part of Annibale Carracci’s *Pietà with St. Francis* [for S. Francesco a Ripa, Rome, now Louvre] but amongst numerous changes, Domenichino substituted Joseph of Arimathea for St. Francis.⁴¹³ Such substitutions were usually made at the request of the patron, who, in this case, is unknown as the painting has no provenance before the late C18th and it was in a private collection until 2007. A number of commentators have suggested that Domenichino probably worked from Annibale’s compositional drawing, rather than the original altarpiece itself.⁴¹⁴ No criticism comparable to Lanfranco’s appears to have been levelled at this work by Domenichino, which probably relates to its relatively small dimensions (53 x 37.5cm. versus the original at 2.77 x 1.86 m.).⁴¹⁵ These would suggest that it was intended for a domestic setting and, if this is correct, would have been seen by only a few, which would make it much less likely to be the subject of public attention. Domenichino and Cigoli were both criticised in respect of large, highly visible, altarpieces and it would not have been worth Lanfranco’s while to try to discredit his rival by citing a work in a private collection. It is also probable that these large paintings were always the subject of greater critical anxiety, especially if they were perceived to cross the boundaries of decorum.

⁴¹¹ They continued in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as Cropper shows in Chapter 5 and the Coda.

⁴¹² Bellori p.24.

⁴¹³ Domenichino’s painting: Christie’s Important Old Master and English Pictures, 5 July 2007, lot no. 40, estimate £2.5-£3.5 million, sold for £3,044,000 (including buyer’s premium).

⁴¹⁴ This picture was purchased by the Metropolitan Museum of Art in 2008 – Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin Fall 2008, New York, p.21. Database accessed online 11/7/10.

⁴¹⁵ Louvre database accessed online 11/7/10.

Seventeenth-century masters and copying

Giulio Mancini (1588-1630), personal physician to Urban VIII, wrote his *Considerazioni sulla pittura* c. 1620, but they remained unpublished until the twentieth century. They seem to have circulated in manuscript form. In the *Considerazioni*, Mancini discussed possible ways in which copies might be detected, especially citing such details as hair or highlights as having ‘brushwork that cannot be imitated’ (it is often thought that copyists render details with too much exactitude).⁴¹⁶ He admits that it can be extremely difficult to detect a copy even when “having both the original and the copy”. As Mancini suggests, it would be likely that the imitator’s personal style would be revealing. It should be borne in mind that Mancini himself commissioned copies of works by Caravaggio, then in the del Monte collection, for Agostino Chigi, as recorded in correspondence with his brother.⁴¹⁷ He says that copies after Caravaggio cost 15 scudi each, which Spear estimates to be equivalent to a month’s salary for one of the musicians employed by the Barberini family at the same time.⁴¹⁸ This is less than half the amount paid 20 years later for a copy of a Poussin by Caroselli (see below).

According to Mancini, Duke Cosimo de’ Medici stated that where someone owned both the copy and the original ‘the copy should be preferred to the original because it contained both skills, that of the originator and that of the copier’. This might be true in the case of Rubens, for example, whose variants of Titian’s mythologies were highly prized by Philip IV, but was less likely to be applied to the numerous anonymous copyists at work at this time. Mancini went on to say that some artists enjoyed ‘imitating the manner of a famous and renowned master so well that it fools the most intelligent people [not in order to deceive for gain, but] through their desire for honor, and in order to make themselves known and gain a reputation’.⁴¹⁹ This statement evidently contradicts the previous statement, because if the painting were sold as the work of another, the reputation of the imitator could not be enhanced unless the deception were to be revealed, and once that revelation took place the success of the deception would be invalidated and the copy would

⁴¹⁶ Mancini, G., *Considerazioni sulla pittura*, eds. A. Marucchi and L. Salerno, 2 v., Rome, 1956-7.

⁴¹⁷ *Caravaggio: I “Bari” della collezione Mahon*, exh. cat. Forlì, 2008, p. 21; Moir, op.cit., p.53.

⁴¹⁸ Spear, R., ‘Scrambling for Scudi: Notes on Painter’s Earnings in Early Baroque Rome’, *AB*, 85, 2003, pp.310-320.

⁴¹⁹ Translation from Enggass and Brown, op. cit., pp.34-5.

be ‘worthless, commercially unsaleable’.⁴²⁰ Mancini offers no solution to this dilemma, but by the time he was writing this was an established trope.

Mancini was himself a witness to a case of this type of deception. In 1621 the Marchese Sannesesi gave permission for his version of Caravaggio’s *Cardsharps* [original, Kimbell Museum, Fort Worth] to be copied, however, his *guardaroba* soon discovered that both the original (valued at 200 *scudi*) and the copy (valued at 3 *scudi*) had disappeared, the thief allegedly being not the copyist but a third party, who then showed either the copy or the original to Mancini.⁴²¹ This is an exceptionally large price differential between original and copy and they must have been the same size or the attempted deception would not have been possible. This case is further complicated by the fact that Sannesesi probably did not own an original by Caravaggio in the first place. The version in the Kimbell bears the stamp of the del Monte collection on the back, thus verifying its status as the first known version; this passed from the Del Monte to the Barberini collection. Further complications arise from the version of the *Cardsharps* purchased by Sir Denis Mahon in 2007. Del Monte is recorded as owning copies of works by Caravaggio, as well as originals and it is clear that Caravaggio himself made repetitions of his own works, such as *The Gypsy Fortune Teller* [Louvre and Capitoline Museum, Rome].⁴²² Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani recorded seeing a version of *The Incredulity of St. Thomas* by Caravaggio [now Potsdam], owned by his brother Cardinal Benedetto, in Genoa in 1606. There are more than 14 known versions of this, some of which were recorded by Malvasia and it has been suggested that this is because Cardinal Benedetto was significantly less opposed to the making of copies than his brother, Vincenzo.⁴²³

Another well-known example is that of Paul Fréart de Chantelou requesting copies from Poussin of his series of the *Seven Sacraments*, originally made for Cassiano del Pozzo. Chantelou expressed his willingness to have those copies made by another artist. Cassiano refused permission initially, but was subsequently persuaded.⁴²⁴ On 12th January 1644, Poussin also responded negatively, citing the ‘too little love, care and clarity’ demonstrated

⁴²⁰ Kurz, O., ‘Early Art Forgeries: from the Renaissance to the eighteenth century’, *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 121, 1974, pp.74-89.

⁴²¹ Cavazzini, 2008, p. 132.

⁴²² Mahon, D., ‘Fresh Light on Caravaggio’s Earliest Period: His ‘Cardsharps’ Recovered’, *BM*, 130, 1988, pp. 10-25 and technical appendix by K. Christiansen, pp.26-27.

⁴²³ Squarzina, S.D., ‘The collections of Cardinal Benedetto Giustiniani. Part I’, *BM*, 139, 1997, pp.766-791.

⁴²⁴ Verdi op. cit., p.241.

by ‘professional copyists’, whose work he described as ‘daubs’. In a key comment, he went on to recognise that the desire to own ‘beautiful things’ meant that ‘one is obliged to content oneself with copies, even badly made, which...could diminish the name of many good painters’ but ‘their originals are viewed by many who know well the extreme difference that exists between them and the copies’.⁴²⁵ He went on to observe ‘But those who do not see anything except a bad imitation easily believe that the original is not a great thing’.⁴²⁶ This is a particularly telling remark, as it makes clear the reasons why a master painter, rightly jealous of his good name, would resent the circulation of second-rate imitations of his work. Viewing works of art was restricted in many ways, as most private collections were generally inaccessible, most altarpieces were kept covered for much of the time and public exhibitions were still comparatively rare, and therefore knowledge of an outstanding artist’s works was both desirable and difficult to obtain. A viewer previously unfamiliar with an artist’s paintings might see a copy or variant painted by a lesser talent and conclude that the master artist was himself not a competent painter. It was important that this situation should be avoided, if possible, and essential for artists to maintain their reputations in order to attract new business. However, it was virtually impossible in reality to prevent dishonest copying, as most painters were only too well aware. This was sometimes perpetrated by members of the master’s own workshop (see below p.106), as well as by other artists, like Sebastien Bourdon (see below p.92).

Poussin consequently decided to make the copies himself; as is perfectly obvious to any observer, the end result does not consist of copies at all, but of variants [Appendix IV, type B].⁴²⁷ Although Poussin did not change the themes depicted, he appears to have produced versions for Chantelou which were generally perceived as superior and this led Poussin to comment to Chantelou that Cassiano would be unhappy if the second set had remained in Rome, but as they would be ‘far away from here, he will swallow the pill more cheerfully’.⁴²⁸ Orazio Gentileschi frequently produced quite close variants of existing compositions when he knew that the variant would be sent away from the first version.⁴²⁹ The question of proximity of copies was undoubtedly one that increasingly exercised the owners of the originals as the seventeenth century progressed. Bernini commented on

⁴²⁵ Spear, 2004, pp.20-23.

⁴²⁶ Spear, 1997, p.266.

⁴²⁷ Both sets were displayed at the Royal Academy in 1995 so as to permit comparison, see Verdi, op. cit., pp.221-231 and 241-255.

⁴²⁸ Ibid. p.242.

⁴²⁹ *Orazio and Artemisia Gentileschi*, exh. cat, New York, 2002, p. 21.

Poussin's greatness as a 'painter of history and fable' in 1665 when looking at a copy of the *Triumph of Pan* which Poussin had painted for Cardinal Richelieu; it is not known whether he was aware that the painting he saw was a copy, although it seems probable that he was.⁴³⁰

The making of copies was carefully controlled by some owners of original works, as Suzanne Butters has shown with reference to Ferdinando de' Medici. She sees the production of sculpted copies of 'statues by ancient and modern sculptors...as discerning variations on a theme' and as 'skilful eulogy'. In cases where the modern copy was made in the original material, this aspect of copying was perceived very favourably as bringing ancient art back to life. As Butters notes, when Grand Duke Ferdinando gave permission for his paintings in Rome to be copied, only single copies were authorised: 'affinché non se ne facessi bottega'. Butters goes on to suggest that numerous copies would have 'threatened the monetary...value of unique works'.⁴³¹ However, most rulers expected their possessions to pass directly to their heirs, with the purpose of enhancing their status and emphasising continuity of rule, and therefore direct financial values were not their primary concern. This is almost certainly the reason why royal inventories do not generally contain values. John Evelyn noted in 1645 in Rome that permission to make copies was 'a civility which in Italy they do not refuse them where any rare pieces of the old and best Masters are extant; and which is occasion of breeding up many excellent men in that Profession'.⁴³²

Despite controlling replication of his paintings, Ferdinando de' Medici used copies as diplomatic gifts (see below). Ferdinando also owned numerous copies of history paintings, some of which he inherited and others which he commissioned. While he was still resident in Rome and not certain of inheriting the Grand Ducal crown, copies filled the gaps in his collection and as in most other cases, these were hung amongst the originals in the collection.⁴³³ These included the acquisition in 1579 of a replica of Raphael's portrait of *Pope Leo X and Two Cardinals*, which may be that now at Holkham Hall, Norfolk and possibly the one executed by Vasari (see above, p.74).

⁴³⁰ The original is in the National Gallery, London. Quoted in Verdi op. cit. p.204.

⁴³¹ Butters, S.G., 'Making Art Pay: The Meaning and Value of Art in Late Sixteenth-Century Rome and Florence', in *The Art Market in Italy 15th–17th Centuries*, eds. M. Fantoni, L. Matthew and S. Matthews-Grieco, Modena, 2003, p.29.

⁴³² *Diary*, II, p. 299.

⁴³³ Cecchi A., 'La Collection de tableaux' in *La Villa Medicis*, 4v., Rome 1991, II, Etudes, pp.486-505.

By the eighteenth century, Raphael's reputation as the artist whose style should be most closely emulated was firmly established and this continued to be the case until the mid-nineteenth century when, for example, the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood publicly rebelled against the notion. Raphael's fame in the eighteenth century was such that in the 1750s the 1st Duke of Northumberland created an expensive gallery in Northumberland House of copies of works from the great tradition by contemporary masters, including Pompeo Batoni's copies after the Raphael workshop frescoes in the Farnesina. Jeremy Wood has provided convincing evidence of the competitive spirit in which this was done. The Batonis are lost and the sole survivor of this scheme appears to be Anton Rafael Mengs' variant copy of *The School of Athens* [now V&A] which was generally admired at the time, although the Northumberland House gallery originally also included copies after Annibale Carracci and Guido Reni. Horace Walpole's comment that he was "so tired with copies of the pictures he [Northumberland] has chosen" would seem to be provoked by the specific examples chosen rather than the idea of copies in themselves; they were too famous and presumably Walpole had seen too many copies of them. The 4th Duke of Bedford already had such a gallery featuring Thornhill's copies [now Royal Academy] of Raphael's Cartoons for the Sistine Chapel tapestries [Royal Collection, on loan to the V&A], which had been in England since their acquisition by Charles, Prince of Wales in 1623 and always very highly praised.⁴³⁴ There is a seventeenth-century set of oil copies at Knole, acquired at an unknown date. Wood calls Northumberland's scheme "exemplary" and that is a comment which also reflects the prevailing attitude towards copies in the seventeenth century, when masterpieces which could not be acquired were represented elsewhere by copies because they represented the canon. The schemes described by Wood were of the type praised in the eighteenth century for preserving the appearance of works in danger of deterioration and improving public taste, but by 1851 the presence of copies in Northumberland House was criticised as "they are destitute of that interest and attraction which are invariably attached to originality...alone".⁴³⁵ Emulation was beginning to decline in importance at this point, although not yet entirely abandoned as part of artistic training, but within a few years novelty would become an increasingly sought-after, but contentious, feature of artistic production.

⁴³⁴ Wood J. 1999; Shearman, J., *Raphael's Cartoons in the collection of Her Majesty the Queen and the tapestries for the Sistine Chapel*, 1972.

⁴³⁵ Wood J. 1999 p.414.

Copies and the problem of Forgery

As Kenneth Clark observed: ‘the definition of forgery depends to a large extent on the intention of the forger’, precisely because as we have seen ‘in ancient civilisations...people continued to work in the style of the past with approval’.⁴³⁶

As discussed below, Renaissance artists were trained by copying the head of the workshop and the great works of the past. De Marchi and Van Miegroet have suggested that ‘forging, can only gain popularity in an environment where art is becoming more individualized...where invention and authorship are considered important and valued’.⁴³⁷

This is indeed true in such examples as that of Claude (discussed below), but there are other cases where the original author was less relevant. For instance, Michelangelo seems to have practised a form of forgery early in his career, as Condivi records that in copying ‘a head’, Michelangelo substituted his work for the original, having ‘used smoke to make it seem as old as the original’; ultimately, Michelangelo revealed the deception and ‘many wanted to compare the two, and they found no difference...this gained him a considerable reputation’.⁴³⁸ However, this is the same trope as that referred to above about Colantonio, used here by Condivi to enhance the status of his hero. Michelangelo’s sculpture of *Sleeping Cupid* (mentioned on p.64) was also taken to be an antique, an error which the artist made no attempt to correct. Mancini stated that forgers of paintings used to make their copies look older by ‘darken[ing] them with smoke from wet straw, so as to give the painting a certain coating similar to that which time produces’ and that ‘to make the deception more effective, they take old panels and paint over them’.⁴³⁹ The same procedure was used in Northern Europe.⁴⁴⁰

Forgeries of contemporary works were also made as early as the sixteenth century, such as those after Bosch cited by De Marchi and Van Miegroet.⁴⁴¹ Subsequently, in the 1630s, Sebastien Bourdon succeeded in producing a fraudulent version of an unfinished painting by Claude. This forgery then passed as an original Claude in Rome.⁴⁴² This was said by

⁴³⁶ Clark in introduction to Kurz op. cit.

⁴³⁷ De Marchi and Van Miegroet, 1996, p.44.

⁴³⁸ Condivi, op. cit., p. 10.

⁴³⁹ Enggass and Brown op. cit, p. 34.

⁴⁴⁰ Brink, op. cit., p.36.

⁴⁴¹ 1996, p.45.

⁴⁴² Kitson, M., *Liber Veritatis*, 1978, p.20.

Claude's early biographer, Filippo Baldinucci, to have prompted the creation of the *Liber Veritatis*, the book in which Claude kept drawn and annotated records of many of his compositions. According to Baldinucci, Bourdon's copies 'brought discredit to the master, disserved the illustrious persons for whom the pictures were painted and defrauded the buyers who bought the copies as originals'.⁴⁴³ Claude's 'illustrious' client in this instance was Philip IV of Spain, who might have remained unaware of the forger's activities, but Bourdon certainly represented a serious threat to the painter's reputation and to his livelihood. Claude had begun his career in Rome in the studio of Agostino Tassi in which 'copying was the main method of instruction' and he must have been more familiar with this practice than Baldinucci implies.⁴⁴⁴ Claude only ever had one *garzone*, who was dismissed for dishonesty, which means that there is no question of the production of copies of works by the assistants or the sort of re-touching by the master observed in the studios of Titian, Rubens and Guido Reni. As Kitson has pointed out, Claude's concern was not about copies, but about forgery. However, the *Liber Veritatis* could not prevent a forgery, it could only protect the artist to some extent if the suspect painting were to be brought to Claude for authentication, giving him the opportunity to discredit it. The *Liber Veritatis* has another disadvantage, in that it does not record every painting Claude produced, for reasons which do not seem entirely clear, nor is every detail of each painting recorded. Claude worked mainly to commission and, in some cases, the name of the commissioner of the painting is included in the record he inscribed on the back of the individual sheets in the book, although sometimes it is merely the name of the city to which the painting was sent. This may be an indication that the *Liber Veritatis* also functioned as a record for the artist himself of his most distinguished clients, which is further implied by his bequest of the book in the first place to his daughter, Agnese, and secondly to his nephews. However, it did also provide a stock of motifs, as well as being a work of art in its own right. As Kitson observed: 'we can do no more than guess what other motives...lay behind it'.⁴⁴⁵ Claude himself, in painting his *View of the Campo Vaccino* [Louvre], can be observed to have adapted a composition by Herman van Swanevelt, which features the same setting with different figures [Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge].⁴⁴⁶ This appears to be the only occasion on which he made such a close adaptation of another artist's work, although he

⁴⁴³ Kitson, op. cit., p.20. Langdon, H., *Claude Lorrain*, 1989, pp.56-7.

⁴⁴⁴ Cavazzini, P., 'Claude's Apprenticeship in Rome: The Market for Copies and the Invention of the *Liber Veritatis*', *Konsthistorisk tidskrift*, 73, 2004, p.139.

⁴⁴⁵ Kitson op. cit. p.10.

⁴⁴⁶ Röthlisberger, M., *Claude Lorrain: The Paintings*, 2v., 1961, I, p.106.

did produce variants of his own compositions, which are not usually recorded in separate drawings in the *Liber Veritatis*.⁴⁴⁷

Copies as historical evidence of original works:

I Titian's *Emperors*

Copies can, in fact, provide invaluable information to modern historians about lost or severely damaged works of art. Titian's series of the *Caesars* are a good example of the value of copies, as in this case the originals were amongst the works most desired by collectors in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and all that survives are various copies. This series does not fall into the usual category of portraiture, in that these paintings are imaginative representations of historical personages, rather than the more usual portraits of living sitters. Their role was clearly to suggest some kind of ancient lineage for their owners, originally intended to impress both visitors and courtiers with the virtues of the Gonzaga of Mantua as notable rulers.

Subsequently, they were purchased by Charles I from the Gonzaga and displayed with van Dyck's equestrian portrait of the king with M. de St. Antoine in order to make the same point in London as that originally intended in Mantua. After the execution of Charles I, Titian's *Caesars* were sold to Captain [John] Stone on 23rd October 1651.⁴⁴⁸ Stone sold them on to the Spanish ambassador, Cárdenas and they were destroyed in the burning of the Alcazar, Madrid, in 1734, and are only known to us from copies. Titian only seems to have painted 11 originally, rather than the canonical 12 referred to by Suetonius, possibly because there were only 11 spaces in the Camerino dei Cesari, with a *Domitian* added in 1562 probably by Bernardino Campi (although attributed to Giulio Romano in the 1627 Mantua inventory). Titian's *Caesars* were praised by contemporaries, including Lomazzo, in a section omitted from Haydocke's translation.⁴⁴⁹ When they arrived in London in 1628 two were severely damaged and Van Dyck was paid £5 for restoring Galba and £20 for providing a replica of Vitellius.⁴⁵⁰ Consequently, the set originating in Mantua

⁴⁴⁷ Röhrlisberger, M., and Kitson, M., 'Claude Lorrain and the 'Liber Veritatis' – II', *BM*, 101, 1959, pp.380-386, 333.

⁴⁴⁸ *Sale*, p.270.

⁴⁴⁹ *Trattato dell'Arte della Pittura Scultura ed Architettura di Gio. Paolo Lomazzo, Pittore del XVI Secolo, diviso in sette libri*, 3v., Rome 1844, II, p.369. Haydocke's translation is further discussed in Chapter 3.

⁴⁵⁰ Carpenter, op. cit., p.71.

which eventually went to Madrid only contained 10 original works by Titian. There were already several sets of copies of these images in Spain, including one in the collection of Philip II by Campi (which may have originated in the collection of one of three prominent courtiers who placed orders with Campi). There was another set of copies by Fermo Ghisoni (1574) in the collection of Philip's first minister, Antonio Perez, which may be the set subsequently acquired by Rudolf II when Perez fell from favour, although it should be noted that Campi had already supplied a set to the Emperor Ferdinand I.⁴⁵¹ The 1585 inventory of Antonio Perez's collection records two series of twelve Roman emperors, the set by Ghisoni having been a diplomatic gift from Duke Guglielmo Gonzaga.⁴⁵²

These paintings by Titian were particularly well-known and copies of them were much desired. Amongst the surviving sets of copies, that in Palazzo Ducale, Mantua, (see ill. 8) has been attributed to Campi, who is known from a contemporary biography to have made five sets of copies, one of which survives in Naples. The Mantua set has also been attributed to the copyist Pietro Facchetti; the latter attribution was dismissed by Wethey (who gives no reason), but it would be worth re-considering this in view of Facchetti's role in the production of copies of paintings for the diplomatic gift taken from Mantua to Spain by Rubens in 1603, although it is recognised that the set of *Caesars* now in Mantua has not always been there. The set in the Munich Residenz, now incorporated into the eighteenth-century décor and extended to fit the spaces, was made in Mantua in 1567-8 and delivered by Jacopo Strada to Munich as a diplomatic gift in 1568.⁴⁵³ Domenico Fetti, who worked in Mantua 1614-22, painted two different images of the Emperor Domitian [Louvre and Pommersfelden, Schloss Weisenstein] which were not included in the sale to Charles I and remained in Mantua until 1707.⁴⁵⁴ Neither of these exactly resembles the other, nor bears any direct resemblance to the engravings after Titian by Sadeler; they are not discussed by Wethey. Either one of them may have been intended to extend the original set to twelve, perhaps even to replace Campi's version (mentioned above). While in Venice awaiting shipment to London, a set of copies was ordered from Giovanni Arisio da Viadana (otherwise unknown as a painter); these have not been traced. They could be the set

⁴⁵¹ Wethey, III, pp.43-7 & 235-40.

⁴⁵² Delaforce, A., 'The Collection of Antonio Pérez, Secretary of State to Philip II', *BM*, 124, 1982, pp.742-753.

⁴⁵³ Verheyen, E., 'Jacopo Strada's Mantuan Drawings of 1567-8', *AB*, 49, pp. 64-70. The Munich set are now set into the Rococo decorations of the Antechamber, the Outer Audience Room and Inner Audience Room (nos. 55, 56 and 57 of the Residence) as overdoors.

⁴⁵⁴ Safarik, E.A., *Domenico Fetti 1588/89-1623*, exh. cat. Mantua, 1996, no. 74.

purchased in Venice (at an unknown date), which was lent to the *Art Treasures* exhibition 1857 (Manchester), little of which now survives. After the paintings by Titian arrived in London, the only complete set of copies which seems to have been made was that at Penshurst noted by George Vertue, but their date is unknown.⁴⁵⁵

In the *Sale* documents ‘Twenty and 2 halfe pictures of y^e Empero^{rs} of Rome’ were sold on 21 May 1650 for £5 15s.; this reference does not mention Titian (for whom the price is far too low), but suggests a similar set, or sets, indicative of the fame of these images. Some of these may have been inherited from Anne of Denmark, as the inventory of Denmark House taken after her death in 1619 lists ‘Twelve pictures of the first roman Emperors’ in the Pages gallery.⁴⁵⁶ This set may have originated in the commission in about 1610-11 from Henry, Prince of Wales, to Paulus van der Velde for such paintings, which may or may not have owed something to the engravings of Titian’s paintings (the originals were not yet in London).⁴⁵⁷ Alternatively, those recorded in the *Sale* may have been copies made for Charles I directly from Titian’s originals. There were ‘xxiiij^{tie} pictures of Popes & Emperors’ in the Great Chamber at Wardour Castle in 1605 [Appendix II, p.1], which presumably consisted of a similar series of pictures, as well as ‘lxxxvj pictures of smale and great wth the poettes’ in ‘the Gallerye’ [Appendix II, p.2]. As there were as many as 86 of the latter group, perhaps the ‘smale’ ones were miniatures.

The fame of Titian’s series is indicated by the number of copies recorded in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A ‘Galba a Coppy of Titian...far bigger than the life’ was noted by Symonds in the Borghese collection in Rome in 1650 [not traced].⁴⁵⁸ An inventory of this collection dateable to between 1615-30, not mentioned by Anne Brookes, shows that this copy was present in the collection some years before Symonds’ visit and that it was then and subsequently a single representation and not part of a set, the latter being more desirable.⁴⁵⁹ Symonds also noted a complete set of copies of the Caesars in Palazzo Farnese, carefully relating them to those acquired from Mantua by Charles I, but apparently unaware that they were attributed to Annibale Carracci, an attribution which appears in

⁴⁵⁵ Wethey, III, L-12; Vertue, II, p.52.

⁴⁵⁶ Payne, M.T.W., ‘An inventory of Queen Anne of Denmark’s ‘ornaments, furniture, householde stuffe, and other parcell’s at Denmark House, 1619’, *JoHoC*, 13, 2001, pp.23-44, 40.

⁴⁵⁷ Wilks, 2005, p.160.

⁴⁵⁸ Brookes, 2007, p.78.

⁴⁵⁹ Corradini, S., ‘Un antico inventario della quadreria del Cardinale Borghese’ in *Bernini Scultore: La Nascita del Barocco in Casa Borghese*, exh. cat. Rome 1998, pp.449-456, p.456.

both the 1644 and 1653 inventories.⁴⁶⁰ This attribution has been doubted by Bertrand Jestaz and an alternative attribution to Campi has been proposed by him, however, this remains undecided.⁴⁶¹ As Symonds calls the Mantua pictures ‘copyes or originals’, his words imply that either he was aware that Charles had not possessed a complete set of original works or that Symonds entertained the possibility that they could all have been copies, although this was not the generally accepted view. In Palazzo Farnese, these copies of Titian’s paintings were displayed with ‘old’ busts of the emperors, but the collection also contained modern copies of the busts of the emperors, a set being purchased in 1562 from Tommaso della Porta, in order that the palazzo should be perceived as a “complete” museum.⁴⁶² The large numbers of copies after Titian’s paintings provide evidence not only of the desire on the part of collectors to raise their status through the display of imperial figures, whose presence would suggest a distinguished ancestry for their owner, but also of Titian’s fame and the desirability of owning works which could be associated with him. In addition, the early copies assist in understanding the original format and composition of these important lost works much better than the engravings by Sadeler.

Other groups of portraits of historical personages comprised philosophers and outstanding heroes and were made as moral exemplars for the viewers. In 1611 Henry, Prince of Wales was sent some copies of those in the Medici collection.⁴⁶³ Sets of English monarchs in various English collections no doubt performed some similar functions, even if the quality of the painting was somewhat different. In 1586/7 the 9th Earl of Northumberland paid £24 for 24 ‘antick pictures of the Emperours of Rome’, which also appear in his probate inventory of 1633: ‘twentyfoure Emperours’, however, these do not appear to have been retained by his son.⁴⁶⁴ As noted in Chapter I, a comparable set of emperors was at Wardour Castle. Such sets of partly imaginary images of ancestors were also to be found in

⁴⁶⁰ Brookes, 2007, p.84; *Le Palais Farnèse, III, 3: L’Inventaire du Palais et des Propriétés Farnèse à Rome en 1644*, ed B. Jestaz, Rome, 1994, no. 3234; Brookes, A., ‘Richard Symonds and the Palazzo Farnese, 1649-50’, *JoHoC*, 10, 1998, pp.39-157.

⁴⁶¹ Jestaz op. cit.

⁴⁶² *I Farnese: Arte e Collezionismo*, exh. cat. Parma, 1995, p.53.

⁴⁶³ Strong, R., *Henry, Prince of Wales and England’s Lost Renaissance*, 1986, pp.190-191.

⁴⁶⁴ Compared with £17 for 2 portraits by “Hubbert” [Hubert Beuckelaer] and 60s. for a Hilliard: G.R. Batho, ‘The Household Papers of Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland’, *Camden Society*, XCIII, 3rd series 1962. Wood, J., ‘Van Dyck and the Earl of Northumberland; Taste and Collecting in Stuart England’, in *Van Dyck 350*, eds., S.J. Barnes and A.J. Wheelock, 1994, pp.281-324, 294.

Charles I's collection.⁴⁶⁵ These sets in England were closely related to sets of contemporary engravings, which became widely available in the seventeenth century.⁴⁶⁶

II – Further examples of copies as historical evidence of lost or damaged works

Another example of the importance of early copies in providing information is evidenced by the urgent search in 2007 for a copy of Dürer's *Madonna of the Rose Garden* (1506, National Gallery, Prague) by Johann Rottenhammer in order to aid a proper restoration of the original work. It was known that the copy (Appendix IV, type G) had been made for the church of San Bartolomeo, Venice, when the original was taken to Prague in 1606 on the orders of Rudolf II. The whereabouts of the copy after 1945, when it was recorded in England, are unknown.⁴⁶⁷

According to Vasari, Raphael's *Transfiguration* [Vatican] is discoloured due to his use of what Vasari described as "smoke black". This remains a matter of debate, which can probably only be resolved by a new technical examination of the original work, but it does seem likely.⁴⁶⁸ The existence of a copy may also help to resolve this question. When the painting was retained in Rome by Cardinal Giulio de' Medici (later Pope Clement VII), rather than being sent to the Cathedral in Narbonne, a copy was commissioned from Raphael's workshop assistant, Gianfrancesco Penni. This is an exceptional case, as Raphael's premature and unexpected death ensured that he "won" the competition with Sebastiano del Piombo, whose *Raising of Lazarus* [NG] went to France. No doubt these circumstances helped to ensure the choice of Penni as the copyist; his copy is probably the version now in the Prado, Madrid, although there is some disagreement about its provenance prior to its arrival there.⁴⁶⁹ Three copies of the *Transfiguration* were recorded in the Escorial early in the seventeenth century.⁴⁷⁰ Penni's copy is considerably smaller and, puzzlingly, he has changed the colours of the robes worn by several of the foreground figures. Most importantly, his copy is much lighter in overall tonality in the lower area,

⁴⁶⁵ Van der Doort, pp.28-34.

⁴⁶⁶ Gibson, R., 'The National Portrait Gallery's Set of Kings and Queens at Montacute House', *The National Trust Year Book 1975-6*, pp. 81-87; Foister, S., 'Edward Alleyn's Collection of Paintings' in *Edward Alleyn: Elizabethan Actor, Jacobean Gentleman*, exh. cat. Dulwich Picture Gallery, 1994, pp. 33-62.

⁴⁶⁷ AN October 2007 p.42.

⁴⁶⁸ Last examined in the 1970s; vanVan Eikema Hommes, M., *Changing Pictures: Discoloration in 15th-17th Century Oil Paintings*, London, 2004, p.173.

⁴⁶⁹ Passavant, J-D., *Raphael d'Urbain et son Père Giovanni Santi*, Paris, 1860, v.II, p.296.

⁴⁷⁰ *Rafael en España*, exh. cat. Prado, 1985, p.11.

which may be a reflection of discolouration in Raphael's painting. However, it is also likely that Penni's copy was seen as "perfecting" the original, which seems quite surprising given the circumstances of its making.

The anonymous seventeenth-century copy of Leonardo's *Mona Lisa*, which once belonged to Joshua Reynolds and which was displayed at Dulwich Picture Gallery in 2006, reveals certain details that are no longer visible in the original, such as the parapet moulding and a shadow from one of the columns.⁴⁷¹ Technical examination shows that this copy was almost certainly made by tracing, which would replicate the former, but not the latter. Guido Reni's *Bacchus and Ariadne* made for Henrietta Maria for the Queen's House, Greenwich, may have been destroyed in about 1650 because it was perceived to be indecent (see Chapter Three, p.153). The whole composition is now known only through copies, of which the best is usually considered to be the engraving by G.B. Bolognini.⁴⁷²

Some of the copies cited here were made partly for the purpose of recording works which had gone to distant locations, while other copies are a reflection of the special desirability of certain unattainable works. All these examples reveal the usefulness of studying such copies today when they can reveal such important information about works which are no longer available in their originally intended form.

The roles of agents and dealers

In addition to commissioned copies, there were other methods of acquisition. Art agents and diplomats were important routes for the dissemination of copies around Europe. Many copies were acquired through purchase. The great majority of the collectors discussed in this thesis employed agents to act on their behalf in the acquisition of works of art. Questions arise as to the extent of their knowledge and consequently as to the possibility that they were defrauded, possibly by dealers. Where agents were employed by such notable collectors as the Earl of Arundel, the Duke of Buckingham or the Marquess of Hamilton, who were not always able to travel themselves, it is possible that those agents were the purchasers of copies or fakes and that they may not have been able to distinguish these from original works. David Howarth has suggested that Arundel's principal agent,

⁴⁷¹ Burrell, M., 'Reynolds's *Mona Lisa*', *Apollo*, 164, September 2006, pp.64-71.

⁴⁷² Banta, A.B., 'A 'Lascivious' Painting for the Queen of England', *Apollo*, 159, June, 2004, 66-71.

the Rev. William Petty, may have operated at the top of a “pyramidal structure” of agents and thus was not always aware of what he was purchasing. Howarth cites as evidence a letter from Arundel’s son, Maltravers, which can be interpreted to indicate that Petty had purchased a famous collection of drawings from Naples, but had not inspected the individual items himself.⁴⁷³ Despite this, closer examination of Arundel’s correspondence with Petty would seem to indicate that the Earl valued his judgement highly (see Chapter Three p.155). Even if agents were generally trusted, the possibility remains that they sometimes made serious errors, perhaps acquiring something which was not the prime version, but a copy. The decorative painter William Smith, whose letter of March, 1616, to Arundel was referred to in Chapter I, was granted an export licence from Rome in January 1626 for a diverse range of paintings and other objects, including copies (see Chapter Three, p.155). A letter from Maltravers of 5th July, 1626, seeking a ‘booke...of Giovinni d’Udines’ refers to the likelihood that: ‘Mr Smith may know of it’ and this is clearly the same person, trusted to perform the role of agent for the family.⁴⁷⁴ The correspondence between Hamilton and his agent in Venice is discussed in Chapter Three (pp.166-173).

In Antwerp, the early seventeenth century had seen the inexorable rise of the art dealer, particularly during the Twelve Year Truce (1609-21), which coincided with the return of Rubens to the city.⁴⁷⁵ Elizabeth Honig notes that Antwerp dealers’ ‘inventories are often quite full of’ copies ‘sometimes...listed as “x number of copies”’, but she suggests that the situation regarding copies in dealers’ inventories was different in the Dutch Republic.⁴⁷⁶ As is well known, the art market was well developed in Amsterdam and auctions were held regularly there. In this connection, J.M. Montias noted that: ‘There were relatively few paintings sold [between 1597 and 1638] that were said to be copies after named masters [except] one after Titian’. Montias does not mention the subject matter of the latter; he also states that ‘Many more, of course, are presumed to have been sold without being identified as [copies]’.⁴⁷⁷ The consequence of this would have been that the buyers were

⁴⁷³ Howarth, D., ‘A Question of Attribution: Art Agents and the Shaping of the Arundel Collection’ in *Your Humble Servant: Agents in Early Modern Europe*, eds. H. Cools, M. Keblusek and B. Noldus, Hilversum, 2006, pp.17-29.

⁴⁷⁴ Hervey, M.F.S., *The Life, Correspondence & Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel “Father of Vertu in England”*, Cambridge, 1921, p.253.

⁴⁷⁵ Vermeylen, F., ‘The Art of the Dealer: Marketing Paintings in Early Modern Antwerp’ in *Your Humble Servant: op. cit.*, pp.109-119.

⁴⁷⁶ Honig, E.A., *Painting and the Market in Early Modern Antwerp*, 1998, pp.113 and 262, n.70.

⁴⁷⁷ Montias, J.M., *Art at Auction in 17th Century Amsterdam*, Amsterdam, 2002, p.97.

defrauded by being charged the price of an original for a copy and it also implies that purchasers at auction were not particularly knowledgeable.

The potential problems can be illustrated by the case of the dealer Gerrit Uylenburgh, who was accused of having cheated Friedrich Wilhelm, Elector of Brandenburg, in 1671 by selling him twelve pictures which were ‘not authentic originals but merely later copies’.⁴⁷⁸ The Elector had sent court officials to Amsterdam to make purchases on his behalf, but may have had other dealings with Uylenburgh before this episode. Initially, the Elector accepted the paintings. However, Hendrick Fromantiou, employed by the Elector as court painter, had turned against Uylenburgh, whose family was well-known for running a copying workshop in which Fromantiou had worked. He persuaded the Elector to return the paintings and accompanied them to Amsterdam, with instructions to prove that they were copies. At Fromantiou’s behest, a committee of artists, some of whom were appointed by the city magistrates in Amsterdam, was asked to appraise the paintings and pronounced them ‘rubbish’ (partly because of their condition), although not specifying them as copies.⁴⁷⁹ Uylenburgh summoned a rival group of artist appraisers, whose opinions were generally favourable, including the statement that the paintings were ‘as good as anything...in the collections of the cardinals in Rome’. (In fact, a number of these, of course, contained copies). Another opined that ‘none...were copies’, an opinion repeated by another group of artists in The Hague.⁴⁸⁰ The diplomat and friend of Rembrandt, Constantijn Huygens, whose travels had taken him to Venice and London, did not believe them to be copies. He found the accuser bent on ‘ruining Uylenburgh’s reputation’ and noted that the pictures had been deemed “original” when in the famous collection formed by Gerard Reynst. Much of that collection had been acquired from the collection of the Vendramin family in Venice and descriptions of some of the Uylenburgh pictures correspond to the catalogues of that collection; they do not appear to have been original works. (The agent for the Vendramin was the copyist and dealer, Regnier, who will be discussed in the context of the Hamilton collection (Chapter Three, pp.166-167). Some paintings, “the cream of the collection”, from the Reynst collection had been selected by Uylenburgh as a diplomatic gift to Charles II in 1660.⁴⁸¹ The rejected paintings, some of which were sold by Uylenburgh in a lottery in 1673, (only one appears to survive), bore attributions to Titian (5), Giorgione (1) and Raphael (1), among others. It seems possible

⁴⁷⁸ *Uylenburgh*, op. cit., p.83.

⁴⁷⁹ Their condition was also the subject of unfavourable comment in Antwerp and Rotterdam.

⁴⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, p.85.

⁴⁸¹ *Ibid.* p.99.

that Uylenbergh knew that they were not all he claimed, although they may have emanated from the workshops of the masters named.⁴⁸² De Marchi and van Miegroet note that it has been estimated that 50% ‘of the paintings produced in the Dutch Republic may have been copies’.⁴⁸³ The sculptures included in Uylenburgh’s transaction with the Elector, which do survive, appear to have been heavily restored, but they do not seem to have been involved in this dispute.

It was, of course, most unlikely that anyone could prove that the paintings were copies, unless access could have been obtained to “originals” that all parties could agree upon. These problems continue to plague the modern art market. It is perhaps not surprising at this date that no attempt was made to trace the provenance of the works, for example, but only to rely on the connoisseurship of the artists summoned by the opposing sides, which inevitably proved inconclusive. The concept of provenance research, to establish the authenticity of a painting by tracing it back to its first documented owner(s), had yet to really take hold. It seems to have become much more important early in the eighteenth century when it was the subject of the complaint that ‘the Value that is set on Paintings depends not only on the Name of the Master...the Scarcity of his Works, and...unreasonabl[y] the Quality of the Persons in whose Possession they are well as the length of Time they have been in great Families’.⁴⁸⁴ This criticism implies that paintings were not being valued on the basis of the quality of design and execution, but rather for what we might now term as reasons of snobbery.

In seventeenth-century France, sales were commonplace after the death of an owner, owing to the need to divide the estate between the heirs (unlike the English system of primogeniture). Schnapper has shown that these sales were the driving force behind the prices in probate inventories there, where they were used as the base price for the subsequent auctions.⁴⁸⁵ No public auction of works of art in England is recorded before that at Somerset House in 1674.⁴⁸⁶ However, two important sales preceded this, which were those of the Earl of Dorset, in 1645, and Charles I, in 1649-52, both of which were

⁴⁸² Ibid., p.100.

⁴⁸³ De Marchi and van Miegroet, 1994, p.455, n.26.

⁴⁸⁴ De Marchi and Van Miegroet, 1994, p.454.

⁴⁸⁵ Schnapper, A., ‘Probate Inventories, Public Sales and the Parisian Art Market’ in *Art Markets in Europe 1400-1800*, eds. M. North and D. Ormrod, Aldershot, 1998, pp.131-141.

⁴⁸⁶ Cowan, B., ‘Arenas of Connoisseurship: Auctioning Art in Later Stuart England’, in North and Ormrod, pp.153-166.

enforced by the political upheavals of the 1640s. A comment in a letter from the 3rd Marquess of Hamilton to Feilding in February 1637 about:

‘a collection of picturs cume hoome booght...by your servant [and] tou partoners, servants to Northumberland and Cottington, it is reported they stand them in 700 pound, they ar most of them coopies, and hardly ther will be goot halfe thatt munnie for them’

would suggest that this was a speculative venture.⁴⁸⁷ Both Northumberland and Cottington were themselves knowledgeable about paintings and whether they and Feilding were silent partners in this venture cannot be ascertained.

Dealers were well organised and had an established presence in most major European cities, even though their activities were frequently called into question, as illustrated by the Uylenbergh case and by Montias’ comment above. Indeed, as De Marchi and Van Miegroet note, ‘dealers...made a practice of buying or gaining access to originals which they then had copied repeatedly’, regarding ‘originals as capital assets’.⁴⁸⁸ However, the presence of art dealers cannot be attested in London until the 1650s and the lively auction market seen elsewhere would not be replicated in London until after the Restoration.⁴⁸⁹ From then on, Brian Cowan notes that as sales catalogues were perfunctory the buyer needed ‘to separate the original masterpieces from the second-rate copies’ and perceives a ‘proliferation of copies on the market’ and that collectors might have reason to fear as “‘collections of pictures injudiciously made, are the sport and contempt of the spectator”’.⁴⁹⁰

Artistic training and the role of copies

Training usually consisted of learning to copy the style and technique of the head of the workshop ‘using the same materials, and as far as they could, the same technique as the master’.⁴⁹¹ From Cennino Cennini, writing in the early C15th onwards, writers of artistic

⁴⁸⁷ Shakeshaft 1986 p.123.

⁴⁸⁸ De Marchi and Van Miegroet, 1996, pp.32,33.

⁴⁸⁹ Ormrod, D., ‘The Rise of the London Art Market, 1660-1760’ in *Economia e Arte Secc. XIII-XVIII*, ed. S. Cavaciocchi, Prato, 2002, pp.303-321.

⁴⁹⁰ Cowan op. cit., pp.158, 161.

⁴⁹¹ Gould, C., ‘The Raphael Portrait of Julius II, Problems of Versions and Variants; and a Goose that turned

theory and painters such as Leonardo acknowledged that this was the way to learn.⁴⁹² Painters would be urged to find good examples by a recognised master and to ‘copy them at any opportunity...until you master the proportions and forms of the original’.⁴⁹³ Vasari recognised that this was the way to learn, but he noted that imitating the master was to be avoided when studying nature, as there was a risk of someone else’s mannerisms impeding a proper study.⁴⁹⁴ Amongst other examples, he cites Masaccio’s frescoes at S. Maria del Carmine as an essential tool in the learning process for many artists: ‘all the most celebrated [artists]...have become excellent and famous by...studying in this chapel’. Vasari then lists them, including ‘Domenico del Ghirlandajo...Leonardo da Vinci...the most divine Michelangelo...likewise Raffaello...Andrea del Sarto...Baccio Bandinelli...and Toto del Nunziata’.⁴⁹⁵ This is a somewhat heterogeneous group, with many stylistic differences; Toto was one of several Italians who came to England to work for Henry VIII. As noted by Patricia Rubin, Vasari has most to say about imitation in the life of Mino da Fiesole, in a passage which varies very little between the 1550 and 1568 versions.⁴⁹⁶ Here, Vasari warns artists against merely ‘imitat[ing] the manner of their masters...[as] they cannot by these means alone attain to perfection’, but they must also imitate nature.⁴⁹⁷ Vasari paid special tribute to Raphael, whom he identified as the artist who had studied and imitated many others, but ultimately achieved a truly admirable style of his own, despite his inability to imitate Michelangelo’s mastery of the male nude. Vasari noted Michelangelo’s study of Signorelli’s frescoes in Orvieto and their impact on the figures on the Sistine Chapel ceiling, although Michelangelo himself was reluctant ever to acknowledge any other artists’ influence on him. In general, Vasari felt that Michelangelo’s own work was inimitable because it had a certain effortless mastery which could not be replicated.⁴⁹⁸

Learning by precisely copying the master of the workshop is an aspect of artistic training which can cause difficulties for those wishing to determine the autograph status of a painting, since with artists such as Raphael, Rubens and Titian, they would be ‘assisted even in the so-called original’ and ‘there will be no totally autograph and no totally non-

into a Swan’, *Apollo*, 92, September, 1970, pp.186-189.

⁴⁹² Bambach, op.cit. p. 82.

⁴⁹³ *Dionysius of Fournia*, op.cit., p.4.

⁴⁹⁴ Gregory op.cit. p.10.

⁴⁹⁵ Vasari, *Lives*, I, p.323.

⁴⁹⁶ Rubin, P., *Giorgio Vasari: Art and History*, 1995, pp.246-248.

⁴⁹⁷ Vasari, *Lives*, I, pp.475-476.

⁴⁹⁸ Gregory op. cit. p.29.

autograph version'.⁴⁹⁹ Although some workshop assistants never developed independent careers, this method of training did not necessarily prevent the ultimate development of an individual artistic personality and style; despite his denial, Michelangelo was apprenticed in Ghirlandaio's workshop. According to Carlo Ridolfi, Titian endeavoured to tightly control access to his studio, with the result that his assistants would enter in his absence without his knowledge and, allegedly, copy works there which he would then sign as originals.⁵⁰⁰ It is difficult to believe that he would not have noticed that there were two versions of a work, unless the assumption is made that the assistants then sold these works themselves without revealing this transaction. In 1619 in Rome this is exactly what happened to the painter Agostino Tassi, when his assistant Nicolò Bedino sold his copies of Agostino's originals to Cardinal Conti as autograph. Tassi himself had previously sold copies of his own work made by his assistant, Lorenzo Sinibaldi da Todi as autograph.⁵⁰¹ Guido Reni was well known for the fact that his workshop produced multiple versions of certain well-known images, where 'paintings [were] produced in an almost industrial fashion'.⁵⁰² Many works emerging from Reni's studio were executed by various assistants and then retouched by Reni, thus providing 'the precious patina of the "divine hand"'.⁵⁰³ Bellori referred to Guido Reni's pupils making 'large profits...by passing off the retouched copies as originals'.⁵⁰⁴

Pietro da Cortona owned a collection of copies 'for didactic purposes', which underlines their use in workshops.⁵⁰⁵ He appears in several Roman inventories as the author of copies of works by Veronese and Titian; in the case of the latter his copy of the *Mystic Marriage* [formerly Ludovisi Collection, Rome, now NG] survives in Rome.⁵⁰⁶ The didactic usefulness of copies in artistic training was also acknowledged by the numbers of copies assembled by Cardinal Federico Borromeo for the Ambrosiana in 1620. A visit to this institution was recommended by Lord Arundel to John Evelyn, not only for the library, but also for those who wished to 'learne to designe'. Evelyn duly went and (although his diary notes partially repeat Arundel's advice almost word for word), he noted that 'it is a schole

⁴⁹⁹ Gould 1970, p.187.

⁵⁰⁰ Ridolfi, C., *Le Maraviglie dell'Arte*, Venice, 1648, ed. D. von Hadeln, 2v., Berlin 1914-1924, p.227.

⁵⁰¹ Cavazzini, 2004, pp.133-146.

⁵⁰² *The Agony and The Ecstasy: Guido Reni's Saint Sebastians*, exh. cat. Dulwich Picture Gallery, eds. P. Boccardo and X.F. Salomon, Milan, 2007, p.13.

⁵⁰³ Spear 1997, p.265.

⁵⁰⁴ Bellori p.366.

⁵⁰⁵ Cavazzini, 2008, p.68.

⁵⁰⁶ Garas, K., 'The Ludovisi Collection of Pictures in 1633 -I', *BM*, 109, 1967, pp.287-291 and II, pp.339-349, 343 ("1967a").

fit to make the ablest artists', thus reflecting Borromeo's original intention, of which Evelyn had presumably been informed by his guide.⁵⁰⁷

The dissemination of replica copies made in the studio under the supervision of the master could help to promote his fame and that of his workshop. It was also common for artists to make copies for themselves, rather than to commission or with a view to sale, probably in order to 'learn to be more themselves'.⁵⁰⁸ Unfinished works in the master's workshop on his death might be completed subsequently by his most trusted (or sometimes, most talented) assistant and could continue to enjoy the status of an "original" work. An example of this would be Guido Reni's assistant, Giovanni Andrea Sirani, who is said to have 'resold' works he had completed in this way after Reni's death in 1642.⁵⁰⁹ Other members of this family were involved as Evelyn noted in Bologna in May 1645 that 'a Virgin nam'd *Isabell Sirani* now living...imitates *Guido* so well, that many skillfull Artists have ben deceiv'd'.⁵¹⁰

Engravings might be less useful in the context of training as they usually reverse the original image and, of course, omit any suggestion of colour or the texture of the original brushwork. They also usually lack any indication of the scale of the original. Nevertheless, they were used in most workshops and enabled the wide circulation of compositional ideas.

The canon

By the beginning of the seventeenth century, the canon of the great masters of the past was well established. It included most of the following, whose original works, as this study shows, were reproduced in the greatest number of copies:

Raphael

Correggio

⁵⁰⁷ *Remembrances of Things Worth Seeing in Italy given to John Evelyn 25 April 1646 by Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel*, ed. J.M. Robinson, 1987, pp. 24, 42.

⁵⁰⁸ Ekserdjian, D., 'Parmigianino and Michelangelo' in *Reactions to the Master: Michelangelo's Effect on Art and Artists in the Sixteenth Century*, eds. F. Ames-Lewis and P. Joannides, Aldershot, 2003, p.65.

⁵⁰⁹ Modesti, A., 'Patrons as Agents and Artists as Dealers in Seicento Bologna', in *The Art Market in Italy...*, op. cit., p. 368.

⁵¹⁰ *Diary*, II, p. 424.

Titian – particularly his *Bacchanals* and *Caesars* series and *Toilet of Venus*

Annibale Carracci

Caravaggio (at least 307 drawn and painted copies recorded by Moir)⁵¹¹

Claude

Titian seems to be the artist who was most frequently copied by other artists, in addition to being called upon to make copies of other artists' work himself. The *Bacchanals* he had painted for Alfonso d'Este, Duke of Ferrara, were commonly copied in the seventeenth century. The *Bacchanals* included *Bacchus and Ariadne* [NG], *The Bacchanal of the Andrians*, and *The Worship of Venus* [Prado], plus some re-painting of Giovanni Bellini's *The Feast of the Gods* [NGA, Washington]. These were infrequently copied in the sixteenth century, as access was not particularly easy. However, following their forcible removal to Rome in 1598, where they were separated in 1621 when the first two were given to Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi, more numerous copies were made. Amongst the copyists were Padovanino, Poussin and Rubens. As mentioned in the Introduction, it is unclear how a little-known artist like Padovanino gained access to the *Bacchanals* in Rome; it is presumably possible that he was working from copies made by another artist. There are also complex questions about the variants made by Rubens of these paintings, as in theory he could have seen them in Rome before 1608, but appears to have painted his copies much later (see below). Cardinal Ludovico died in 1632, at which point there were a number of interested purchasers for his collection, including the Earl of Arundel and Cardinal Mazarin, although ultimately these expressions of interest came to nothing. The *Bacchanals* by Titian were known in France partly through copies acquired by French courtiers.⁵¹² In 1636 Arundel took the trouble to write from Ratisbon to his agent, William Petty in Italy, urging him to try to acquire from this collection some of the 'best pictures for o^r King'.⁵¹³ Prince Niccolò Ludovisi gave the *Andrians* and *Worship of Venus* to the Count of Monterrey, Viceroy of Naples in August 1633, their departure from Rome having been delayed by 18 months because the Marchese di Castel Rodrigo, Spanish Ambassador to Rome, wanted to have copies made for himself. Monterrey subsequently gave the originals to Philip IV in 1638 after his return to Spain.⁵¹⁴ Padovanino's copies [Bergamo,

⁵¹¹ Moir op. cit.

⁵¹² Sécheval, A. le Pas de, 'Les collection Ludovisi et la politique artistique royale française au XVII^e siècle. Une tentative d'achat à la fin du règne de Louis XIII', *Revue de l'art*, 94, 1991, pp. 69-73.

⁵¹³ Springell, op. cit., p.248.

⁵¹⁴ Anselmi, A., 'Arte Politica e Diplomazia: Tiziano, Correggio, Raffaello, L'investitura di Piombino e notizie su agenti Spagnoli a Roma' in *The Diplomacy of Art: Artistic Creation and Politics in Seicento Italy*, ed. E.

Accademia Carrara] seem to be amongst the earliest to survive, the evidence being his omission of the plants which were later added to make the nude female figure bottom right in the *Andrians* more modest.⁵¹⁵

Padovanino seems to have made the decision to copy only the *Bacchus and Ariadne*, *Worship of Venus* and the *Andrians*, substituting his own composition (*Triumph of Tethys*) for the *Feast of the Gods*. As noted by Loh, this is no doubt a reflection of the fact that he knew the *Feast* was not by Titian and the inclusion of the *Tethys* gave him the opportunity to challenge Titian's work with one of his own. This was an ambitious and expensive project for the artist as, although not discussed by Loh, the cost of the materials would have been high and he then transported the works back to Venice, seemingly not having a patron for these paintings.

It has not previously been noticed that the earliest documentary reference to copies after the *Bacchanals* appears in an inventory of the Borghese collection in Rome. Symonds noted 'copy of Titian's Bacchanalia' in a 'corner Roome' at Palazzo Borghese in 1651.⁵¹⁶ The Borghese inventory of 1615-30, not mentioned by Brookes, now makes it possible to demonstrate that what Symonds was looking at was a copy was made by "Gioseppino", that is the artist more usually known as the Cavaliere d'Arpino.⁵¹⁷ He had been arrested and his collection of 105 paintings seized by Cardinal Scipione Borghese in 1607; the paintings remain in the Borghese collection.⁵¹⁸ Consequently, the Borghese inventory of 1615-30 is likely to be correct on this attribution. D'Arpino is recorded as painting a copy of the Titian *Bacchanal of the Andrians* in Ferrara in 1598.⁵¹⁹ This was therefore the earliest known such copy, pre-dating all the versions later made in Rome. This picture was unknown to either Walker or Wethey, although Haskell alluded to the existence of copies of Titian by d'Arpino, but was unaware of this Borghese inventory.⁵²⁰ Cavaliere d'Arpino also made a high quality, faithful copy of Raphael's *Entombment* [original Galleria Borghese, copy Perugia, National Gallery of Umbria], which has precisely the same measurements as the original. When Scipione Borghese removed the original from the

Cropper, Milan, 2000, pp.101-120.

⁵¹⁵ Walker, J., *Bellini and Titian at Ferrara: A Study of Styles and Taste*, 1956, pp.109, 113. The plants are first recorded in van Dyck's Italian Sketchbook (1622-3).

⁵¹⁶ Brookes, 2007 p.81.

⁵¹⁷ Corradini op. cit. p.454.

⁵¹⁸ Grove Art Online accessed 23.8.10.

⁵¹⁹ Röttgen, H., *Il Cavalier Giuseppe Cesari D'Arpino: un grande pittore nello splendore della fama e nell'inconstanza della fortuna*, Rome, 2002, cat. 87.

⁵²⁰ Haskell, F., *Patrons and Painters: Art and Society in Baroque Italy*, 1980, p.25, n.4.

church in Perugia ‘at dead of night’, this was made as the replacement copy [Appendix IV, type G]. As noted at the Raphael exhibition in 2004, the colours are ‘less vibrant than the original’, but this may reflect the condition of the original at the time d’Arpino was making his copy.⁵²¹ Copies were also made of works by Titian, Veronese, Raphael and Bassano then in the Ludovisi collection for the Fugger family in Augsburg in 1630.⁵²² The export of these copies underlines the fame of the Ludovisi collection and the desire of prominent persons in other countries to possess copies of well-known masterpieces, where the originals were not available.

Alessandro Varotari “il Padovanino” (1588-1649) was well known for his close study of Titian, so that Sir Henry Wotton, former English ambassador in Venice, wrote in an undated letter, ‘Alessandro Padovano, a rising Titian, as we esteem him’.⁵²³ Padovanino did not only copy Titian, but also produced variants such as his version of the so-called “*Allegory of the Marques del Vasto*” [Munich], which substitutes a satyr for the human male figure in the original. He also copied Titian’s *Blindfolding of Cupid* [Borghese], a version of which attributed to him is currently on the market.

Symonds’ visit to Palazzo Barberini was either brief, or more fully recorded in a lost notebook, but he does not mention copies there. However, the inventory of Cardinal Francesco Barberini dated 1631-6 includes ‘Un quadro, d’un baccanario, con un satiretto, che tira la testa di un vitello, *copiato dal Maltese* da un di *Titiano*, che hanno li signori Altobrandini...largo palmi 6’.⁵²⁴ This would appear to be extracted from the larger composition of *Bacchus and Ariadne* [NG], as neither of those more significant figures is mentioned in the description [Appendix IV, type J]. Andrea Sacchi in 1654 arranged for copies of Bacchanals attributed to Dosso Dossi in the ‘Cammerini di ferrara’ to be made for the Barberini, the copyist is not named.⁵²⁵ This is difficult to interpret as Dosso is known to have painted the frieze pictures, which are not bacchanalian in subject matter, and only one Bacchanal to hang with Titian’s works [lost].

⁵²¹ *Raphael: from Urbino to Rome*, exh. cat., NG 2004, cat. 65.

⁵²² Garas, 1967a, I, p. 288.

⁵²³ Pearsall-Smith, L., *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, 2v., Oxford, 1907, II, p.350. Loh follows Howarth in stating that this letter was written to Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury, which is impossible, as Salisbury had died two years before Padovanino’s move to Venice in 1614.

⁵²⁴ Lavin, p.115.

⁵²⁵ Lavin, p. 482.

Worship of Venus [Prado]: according to Bellori, Poussin made a copy of this while it was still in the Ludovisi collection in Rome [untraced]; as he knew Poussin well, this is probably reliable.⁵²⁶ The painting then inspired Poussin's various images containing small cupids, as suggested by Colantuono in 1989, but these are not copies in the terms of this study.⁵²⁷ Rubens made a close copy of it [Stockholm], presumably he could have seen it in the Aldobrandini collection, Rome, but it is puzzling that his copy [Stockholm] of its pendant the *Bacchanal of the Andrians* [Prado] deviates more significantly from the original. It is noteworthy that Rubens did not copy the *Bacchus and Ariadne*, but the reason is unknown. It remains a possibility that Rubens's versions were dependent upon other, lost, copies, which could have been by another artist. Walker (1956) lists several possibilities in this respect and a number of scholars have suggested a copy by van Dyck as Rubens' source. The existence of a copy of the *Andrians* attributed to van Dyck in the inventory of Everhard Jabach has been noted [untraced], but no version by van Dyck of the *Worship of Venus* is recorded.⁵²⁸ Rubens almost never copies another work precisely, but always introduces some thoughts of his own, so that his copying falls into the category of emulation.

Loh states that in copying the Titian *poesie* in the Spanish Royal Collection, Rubens had received a commission from Philip IV.⁵²⁹ This is suggested by Bellori and repeated by Roger de Piles, but it is not borne out by any other evidence. The fact that the copies were purchased by Philip IV from Rubens' estate after his death would not support this opinion. Writing in 1973, Quentin Bell asserted that Rubens' copy of Caravaggio's *Entombment* [original Vatican, copy National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa] and his copy of Titian's *Adam and Eve* [both Prado, Madrid] were made as 'critical interpretations'. This analysis is based on Bell's personal reflections, rather than Rubens' own remarks. Bell also stated that 'exact equivalents' cannot be made and consequently that copies are 'in some degree inferior to the original'.⁵³⁰ These copies were made when Rubens was already the most famous artist in Europe and it was his habit to make copies himself and to make alterations to copies by other artists throughout his life. His practice of copying has been described as

⁵²⁶ Bellori p. 311.

⁵²⁷ Colantuono, A., 'Titian's Tender Infants: On the Imitation of Venetian Painting in Baroque Rome' in *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance*, 3, 1989, pp.207-234.

⁵²⁸ Grossmann, F., 'Holbein, Flemish Paintings and Everhard Jabach', *BM*, 93, 1951, pp.16-25, Appendix I.

⁵²⁹ Loh, 2007, p.11.

⁵³⁰ Bell, Q., 'Copies and Facsimilies of the Old Masters: Their Uses and Abuses', *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 120, pp.478-489.

‘creative or interpretive’. His earliest copies after Northern masters were quite precise, but soon changed to a process of selecting individual motifs from engraved sources; his copies then seem to have been made available to his workshop assistants.⁵³¹ These works are mainly drawn copies or retouched drawings by other artists, the latter featuring most commonly. In respect of Northern artists, the majority of Rubens’s painted copies are of portraits, which will not be considered here.⁵³²

After Titian, Caravaggio was probably the next artist most favoured by patrons who were prepared to own a copy where the original was not available, and many copies of his work can be traced back to renowned collections. As Moir states: ‘before the nineteenth century...a Caravaggio was almost essential to any well-informed seventeenth-century collection’.⁵³³ Examples which were unknown to Moir include two copies of paintings by Caravaggio in the church at Loches, France, which are documented as early as 1608, before the artist’s premature death, indicating that his fame had already spread widely.⁵³⁴ Moir noted that variants [Appendix IV, type F], rather than precise copies [Appendix IV, types A, B & C], were far more numerous in the case of Caravaggio. Recently, however, an example of a copy of a Caravaggio attracted an unusual degree of attention. A close copy (probably Appendix IV, type B) of *The Taking of Christ* (the original, dateable to 1603, is on loan to the National Gallery, Dublin) existed in the Odessa Museum of Western and Eastern Art and was stolen on 31 July, 2008, leading Helen Langdon to state that: “The burglars must have been blind”.⁵³⁵ This copy was exhibited in Milan in 2006 as attributed to Caravaggio, although noted as a “fairly good” copy, possibly dating from the 1620s, by John Gash in his review of the exhibition, who also asserted the “indisputable authenticity” of the work in Dublin.⁵³⁶ Ciriaco Mattei paid Caravaggio for a picture of this subject in January 1603, but Asdrubale Mattei (the youngest of three brothers) then commissioned a copy from Giovanni di Attilio in 1626, while a further four versions have been noted in seventeenth-century Italian inventories.⁵³⁷ Sergio Benedetti, who re-discovered the original *Taking of Christ* in 1990, suggested that the Odessa version was the only surviving

⁵³¹ Belkin, K.L., *Rubens Copies and Adaptations from Renaissance and Later Artists: German and Netherlandish Artists*, 2v., 2009, I, p. 30.

⁵³² Ibid, pp.46,56.

⁵³³ Moir p. 16.

⁵³⁴ In-house database at INHA, Paris.

⁵³⁵ AN, September 2008, p.9; it was reported to have been recovered and arrests made Daily Telegraph 29.6.2010.

⁵³⁶ *Caravaggio e l'Europa: da Caravaggio a Mattia Preti*, exh. cat. Milan/Vienna 2005/6, no. I.15; Gash, J., *BM*, January 2006, pp.57-8. (Seen by the author in Milan).

⁵³⁷ *Caravaggio e l'Europa* op. cit.

version of any quality and that it might be the 1626 Asdrubale Mattei version, but in the absence of any provenance prior to 1870 this must remain speculative.⁵³⁸ These modern disagreements on attribution are, of course, not uncommon and serve to underline the fact that such problems today are not entirely dissimilar from those in earlier periods. The organisers of the Milan exhibition would not have been able to insist that the Odessa picture was exhibited as a copy. The Odessa Museum would not have easily conceded such a downgrading of their picture, since this would undermine the status of the museum as a whole, not just the painting alone.

At least six seventeenth-century copies of Caravaggio's *Burial of St. Lucy* altarpiece survive (most are Appendix IV, type H), one of which (private collection, Rome) permits the viewer to see what is likely to be the original appearance of this now damaged and extensively repainted image; a copy is now in situ in the church in Syracuse [original on deposit at the Galleria Regionale, Syracuse].⁵³⁹ There were a number of copies of Caravaggio's work in Spain, such as that of the 3rd Duke of Alcalá, formerly ambassador to the Holy See and Viceroy of Naples, whose collection of contemporary and Renaissance masters in Seville contained a copy of the *Madonna of Loreto*.⁵⁴⁰ Charles I also owned a copy of this painting (see Chapter Three, p.188).

Most of the artists listed above can be perceived as forming the canon of painters regarded as the most important in succeeding centuries. The ideas which lay behind this would be formalised by institutions such as the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture (founded 1648, re-founded 1663). With the establishment of its Roman outpost in 1666, the Académie required students in their penultimate year to make 'a full-scale painted or sculpted copy of an important example of the art of the past'.⁵⁴¹

Copies and Diplomacy

Copies were considered to be of sufficiently high status to be sent all over Europe as diplomatic gifts at the highest level, further evidence that copies were definitely not thought

⁵³⁸ Caravaggio: *The Master Revealed*, exh. cat. National Gallery of Ireland, 1993-4, esp. p.33.

⁵³⁹ Caravaggio: *The Final Years*, exh. cat., London, 2005, no.10.

⁵⁴⁰ Pons, S.S., 'Las relaciones artísticas entre Italia y Sevilla durante el primer tercio del siglo XVII' in *De Herrera a Velázquez* op. cit., pp.53-68.

⁵⁴¹ *Grove Dictionary of Art*, France XV, 2, p.669.

of as second-rate objects. In discussion of an earlier period, Megan Holmes has proposed that copies of paintings sent by the Medici as diplomatic gifts ‘would have generated Medici signifiers within the new settings and cultural sites where they were displayed’.⁵⁴² Clearly, this would have represented an added benefit to the giver, transcending gratitude for the gift itself, which already placed the recipient under an obligation to the sender.

Exchanges of diplomatic gifts had become increasingly important since the Renaissance and the establishment of a more formal system of diplomacy, with resident ambassadors appointed for longer periods of office and more permanent premises. Much thought and care was expended on the choice of gifts which would assist in the completion of marriage negotiations and peace treaties or ensure the support of the Emperor in a power struggle with the pope. Such gifts frequently included copies of paintings and sculpture. Gifts sent from Florence to Madrid in the late sixteenth century reveal a particular liking at the Spanish court for copies of the miracle-working fresco of the *Annunciation* in SS. Annunziata, Florence, of which many variants of various sizes were despatched and two were recorded in the Duke of Lerma’s collection.⁵⁴³ There was also one in the collection of Don Enrique de Guzman, Seville, which his mother had requested for devotional reasons in 1590, while the ambassador of Tuscany presented the newly-appointed Archbishop of Cordoba with another in 1607.⁵⁴⁴ The Conde and Condesa de Chinchón eventually acquired three different copies of this. The detailed instructions (undated) regarding the third copy state that it ‘should be in the manner of the original’, although the format was to be different.⁵⁴⁵ Numerous versions of this painting were produced by Alessandro Allori, some of which were sent to Spain as diplomatic gifts.⁵⁴⁶ This fresco had been considered the most important in Florence since the late fourteenth century; the granting of indulgences associated with it in 1361 must have ensured its prestige and several early copies were placed in similar locations in churches (i.e. immediately to the left of the entrance), ‘enhancing its efficacy’. This was increased by the authority it gained by its status as an *acheropita* (an image not painted by human hand).⁵⁴⁷ John Evelyn recorded

⁵⁴² Holmes, *Artistic Exchange*, p.50.

⁵⁴³ Goldberg, E.L., ‘Artistic Relations between the Medici and the Spanish courts, 1587-1621: Part I’, *Documents for the History of Collecting*: 21, *BM*, 138, 1996, pp.105-114.

⁵⁴⁴ Possibly a copy by Allori now in the Escorial, Pons op. cit., pp.60, 64.

⁵⁴⁵ Helmstutler di Dio, K., ‘Diego Fernández Cabrera y Bobadilla and the Capilla Mayor at Chinchón’, *BM*, 150, 2008, pp.804-812, 807.

⁵⁴⁶ Salort, S. and S. Kubersky-Piredda, ‘Art Collecting in Philip II’s Spain: the role of Gonzalo de Liaño, king’s dwarf and Gentleman of the Bedchamber: part I’, *BM*, 148, 2006, pp.660-665.

⁵⁴⁷ *Ibid.* pp.110, 113. Examples were also to be found in S. Maria Maggiore and S. Giovanni in Laterano,

both versions of the legend in October, 1644: ‘they report [the Virgins face] was miraculously don for him whilst he slept. Others say ’twas long since painted by St. Luke himself’. When he returned in May, 1645, he repeated that ‘they pretend [it] was don by an *Angel*’.⁵⁴⁸ There are numerous early copies, but by the late fifteenth century its reproduction was limited by the Medici family as de facto rulers of Florence.⁵⁴⁹ Naturally, this increased its desirability.

Alessandro Allori’s *ricordi* make reference to payments in 1582 for a copy or copies of Raphael’s ‘*S. Giovanni*’ to be sent to Spain as a diplomatic gift from the Medici; what was allegedly an original of this subject had already been sent to Secretary Perez in 1578.⁵⁵⁰ However, in view of the very large number of copies in Perez’s collection (see below), this is likely to have been a copy as well. Francesco de’ Medici sent a copy by Jacopo Zucchi of Raphael’s *Transfiguration* [Vatican] to the Marchesa de Santa Croce in Spain in 1580 and two copies of Madonnas by Andrea del Sarto in 1581.⁵⁵¹

Duke Francesco Maria II della Rovere sent an autograph replica in 1588 (Appendix IV, type A) of Barocci’s *Calling of St. Andrew* [original 1580-3, Brussels, Musées Royaux des Beaux Arts] as a diplomatic gift to Philip II for the Escorial [*in situ*].⁵⁵² As the duke was very familiar with the Spanish court, he would have been well aware of the taste there for the work of Titian, whose brushwork had influenced Barocci. Another factor would have been the difficulty of obtaining works by this reclusive artist. The copy was made without Barocci having looked again at the original (then in Pesaro), and was ‘molto lodato da quanti il vedessano’. Originally, the duke’s intention had been to send some horses as well but, characteristically, Barocci was so long in completing this work that one of the horses died.⁵⁵³ Barocci had probably retained a *ricordo* of his original work from which to work, as this was common practice. The components of this diplomatic gift would have been

Rome.

⁵⁴⁸ *Diary*, II, pp.194, 412.

⁵⁴⁹ Holmes, M. ‘The Elusive Origins of the Cult of the Annunziata in Florence’ in *The Miraculous Image in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance*, eds., E. Thunø and G. Wolf, Rome, 2004, pp.97-121.

⁵⁵⁰ Shearman, *Raphael*, p.1297.

⁵⁵¹ Cecchi, op. cit.

⁵⁵² Lingo, S., ‘Francesco Maria della Rovere and Federico Barocci: Some Notes on Distinctive Strategies in Patronage and the Position of the Artist at Court’ in *Della Rovere* 2007, op. cit., pp.179-199; H.P. Olsen ‘Relazioni tra Francesco Maria II Della Rovere e Federico Barocci’ in *I Della Rovere nell’Italia delle Corti*, eds. B. Cleri, et al, Urbino, 2002, III, pp.195-205.

⁵⁵³ Gronau, G., *Documenti Artistici Urbinati*, Florence, 1936, pp.154, 170.

generally similar to those taken to Spain from Mantua by Rubens in 1603, which included eight paintings by Pietro Facchetti after Raphael and Salviati.⁵⁵⁴

In 1612 Henry, Prince of Wales, received a diplomatic gift from the Grand Duke of Tuscany at a time when a marriage was contemplated between these two families. This included some bronzes from Giambologna's workshop, which are unlikely to have been original works by the master himself, but the sort of object 'designed to be produced as [a] multiple'.⁵⁵⁵ Despite this, they were much admired by those close to the prince who had been to Italy. This is one of several instances in which similar practices were adopted with regard to England as to other European countries and helped to introduce the copy as an object of status.

In 1624 Duke Ferdinando Gonzaga sent his set of ten large paintings of *Apollo and the Muses* by Baglione (painted in Rome in 1620) to his aunt, Marie de' Medici, as a gift [these are now on deposit in the musée des Beaux Arts, Arras, from the Louvre], and then requested the artist to produce replicas for his own collection [lost]. She was reported to be delighted with the paintings, which were immediately placed in the new Palais du Luxembourg and proudly displayed to the court; in the opinion of the Mantuan ambassador in Paris, they posed a challenge to the Rubens series she had recently commissioned.⁵⁵⁶ Therefore, they enhanced the international reputation of the Gonzaga only two years before their remarkable collection began to be dispersed.

The Barberini family also considered copies to be suitable gifts, so that a copy of Reni's *Abduction of Helen* was given to the French Ambassador, Charles I, Maréchal de Créquy, in 1633-4 and in 1636 a copy of a Lanfranco Madonna was given to the "Ambassador of France".⁵⁵⁷ Créquy also received as a gift from Cardinal Barberini the original of Caravaggio's *Musicians* [private collection; on loan to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York].⁵⁵⁸ The Imperial Ambassador Prince von Eggenberg left Rome in January 1639 with a copy of Andrea Sacchi's *Allegory of Divine Wisdom* [original in fresco, Palazzo Barberini, copy Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna] and another was given to Cardinal

⁵⁵⁴ *Rubens: Drawing on Italy*, exh. cat., Edinburgh, 2002, p.25.

⁵⁵⁵ Hughes, op. cit, p. 31.

⁵⁵⁶ *Marie de Médicis: un gouvernement par les arts*, exh. cat. Blois, 2003, nos. 50 and 51.

⁵⁵⁷ Colantuono, A., 'The Mute Diplomat: Theorizing the Role of Images in Seventeenth-Century Political Negotiations', in *The Diplomacy of Art...*, pp.51-76.

⁵⁵⁸ *Caravaggio: I "Bari"* op. cit. p.27.

Richelieu [Hermitage, St. Petersburg]; a further copy was recorded in 1631 (see below p.125).⁵⁵⁹ In addition to the gift of Titian's original *Bacchanals* discussed above, copies were made of some of the six further paintings were sent by Prince Niccolò Ludovisi to Naples in 1640 as a gift to the Duke of Medina Torres. It is possible that one of the paintings attributed to Raphael in that gift was in fact a copy.⁵⁶⁰

In March, 1635, a copy of a Correggio Madonna was included in a list of gifts sent by Cardinal Barberini to England, which is probably 'the *Madonna and Child, Magdalene, St. Joseph* copied by S^r Antonio Grimani with a gilded frame' inventoried in September 1629.⁵⁶¹ In February 1637 George Conn, the Papal agent in London, presented Charles I with a copy of Reni's *St. Michael* [original painted 1635 for S. Maria della Concezione, Rome]; both the original and the copy were commissioned by Cardinal Antonio Barberini. The king was reported to have 'recognized at once that [it] was of the school of Guido Reni and at first hesitated whether it were not by his own hand, but then concluded absolutely that it was not, but praised it none the less excessively'.⁵⁶² As these comments appear in Conn's letter to the Cardinal, they were probably not intended to flatter the king's connoisseurship, but rather to reassure the sender that the gift had been accepted without a negative reaction to its status. Correspondence reveals considerable anxiety in Rome about the suitability of the gifts being sent and Orazio Gentileschi was consulted. He referred to the king's 'buon naso' for paintings and noted the monarch's desire to own works by Lanfranco, Spagnoletto and the Carracci because he had none in his collection. These gifts were undoubtedly intended to help to persuade the king to favour Catholicism. In April 1635 Cardinal Francesco Barberini had written to the previous agent, Gregorio Panzani, seeking further information: 'non ha scritto se voglia copie, ò originali, se antiche, ò moderni...', but this may refer to gifts intended for Secretary Windebank and Chancellor Cottington, rather than the king.⁵⁶³ Windebank's interest in Italian paintings is also indicated by the bequest to him of 'The Four Seasons by Old Bassano to hang near his eye in his Parlour (being in little form) which I bought at Venice' in the will of Sir Henry Wotton in 1637. Wotton also bequeathed to Archbishop Laud 'my Picture of Divine Love, rarely copied from one

⁵⁵⁹ Costello, J., 'The Twelve Pictures "Ordered by Velasquez" and the Trial of Valguarnera', *JWCI*, 13, 1950, pp. 237-284.

⁵⁶⁰ Anselmi op. cit., pp.108-110.

⁵⁶¹ Lavin op. cit., p.479.

⁵⁶² Lightbown, 1989, op. cit., p.61. This picture does not appear in *Sale*.

⁵⁶³ Madocks Lister, S., "'Trumperies Brought from Rome": Barberini Gifts to the Stuart Court in 1635' in *The Diplomacy of Art...*, pp.151-176.

in the King's Galleries of my presentation to his Majesty'.⁵⁶⁴ This gift from Wotton to the king is not recorded in van der Doort's catalogue.

Artists as Copyists

Some celebrated artists of original compositions also copied the works of others, but there are also artists who are only known from contemporary references to have been copyists and who are not recorded as having produced independent works. An example of this is Michael Cross (referred to above). While it is often considered that copies would only be made by junior assistants or artists incapable of any independent work, the evidence demonstrates that this is not the case. Writing in 1976, Alfred Moir raised interesting questions about the ability of copyists to judge the authenticity of the works they copied, about whether they were scrupulous in identifying their copies as such and about whether the choice of works to be copied depended on certain factors such as the originals' location, accessibility, size or subject.⁵⁶⁵ In her study of Symonds, Beal dismissed the copyists whose methods could be cause so much damage to the originals as: 'amateurs, who learnt their copying techniques from popular treatises'.⁵⁶⁶ However, this is too narrow a view and some practitioners of questionable techniques were also successful copyists.

While some artists are only recorded as copyists, amongst those others who have been noted in this activity are Andrea del Sarto, Vasari, Veronese, Federico and Taddeo Zuccaro, Alessandro Allori, Annibale Carracci and Rubens; such works by many of these artists survive. Although no such works have been identified, Caravaggio is mentioned as a copyist by both Mancini and Baglione.⁵⁶⁷ Caravaggio himself accused Guido Reni of attempting to steal his personal style in the case of Reni's *Crucifixion of St. Peter* [Vatican]. This painting does not directly copy any known painting by Caravaggio, but it is true that is closer to his style than most of Reni's other work. Ironically, Reni himself expressed concern that his "giovani" would merely resort to stealing his style, rather than learning anything from it.⁵⁶⁸ Perhaps the issue of another artist's ability precisely to imitate one's style was even more threatening than the issue of copying a single work and might be what

⁵⁶⁴ Pearsall Smith, op. cit., I, pp.216-219.

⁵⁶⁵ Moir, op.cit., p.x.

⁵⁶⁶ Beal op. cit., p.202.

⁵⁶⁷ *The Lives of Caravaggio by Giorgio Mancini, Giovanni Baglione and Giovanni Pietro Bellori*, with an introduction by Helen Langdon, 2005, p.28.

⁵⁶⁸ Spear 1997, p. 233.

Claude feared from Bourdon, as discussed above, although the issue of forgery must have also been a concern to him. Writing in the early 1690s, the Comte de Brienne claimed that he could easily detect copies from originals, particularly in the cases of Raphael, Giulio Romano and the Carracci. Despite this, Spear believes that the Reni owned by de Brienne is, in fact, a copy. De Brienne stated that the banker, collector and dealer Everhard Jabach was amongst those who would knowingly sell copies as originals and had indeed done just this when he sold to the Duc de Liancourt a Virgin said to be by Annibale Carracci. This was in reality a copy by Bourdon, a fact which had allegedly passed unnoticed by all except de Brienne himself and M. Passart.⁵⁶⁹ It seems that Claude's fears in respect of Bourdon's activities as a fraudulent copyist were entirely justified. Jabach owned numerous copies of paintings.⁵⁷⁰ He is also recorded as having precise copies of drawings made, retaining the originals and passing the copies off as autograph. Many of the copies were made by Michel Corneille and passed unnoticed by Le Brun.⁵⁷¹

Palma Giovane is generally thought to have gained employment with Duke Guidobaldo II della Rovere when the duke observed him copying Titian's *Martyrdom of St. Lawrence* in the Gesuiti, Venice.⁵⁷² As Titian was the duke's favourite artist, what Palma was copying no doubt played an important part in this episode and even if it is merely an anecdote, it demonstrates how an artist might gain status through this activity. Denys Calvaert, the Flemish-born artist active in Bologna in the late sixteenth century, was perceived as a virtuoso copyist, with a dealer called Pomponio passing off his copies as originals; however, as this contention was made as late as 1832, it should probably be treated with caution. Calvaert's copy of Raphael's altarpiece of *S. Cecilia* [Bologna] made in the 1570s survives in Dresden.⁵⁷³

Artists who are now little known are recorded by contemporaries as specialist copyists such as Antonio Mariani, known as della Cornia (c.1584-1654, otherwise Corgna). Evelyn made various notes to himself in his diary about things he wanted to remember in Rome (in May 1645) including in his list of three artists: 'Antonio de la Cornea who has an adresse of count(e)rfiting the hands of the antient Masters, as to make his Copies passe for Originals'.

⁵⁶⁹ Ibid. p. 273.

⁵⁷⁰ Grossmann op.cit.

⁵⁷¹ *The King's Drawings from the Musée du Louvre*, exh. cat. Denver, 2006, p.13.

⁵⁷² Fontana, 2007, op. cit., 176; presumably the copy was on a reduced scale, given the size of the original.

⁵⁷³ *The Age of Correggio and the Carracci: Emilian Painting of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, exh. cat., Washington, 1986, p. 77.

Despite this encomium, Evelyn only records having employed ‘my Painter Carlo Napolitano’ as his copyist while in Italy, the painter usually assumed to be Carlo Maratta.⁵⁷⁴ However, it may be worth noting that a copy of Raphael’s *Transfiguration* by Carlo Viva Napolitano is recorded in the Barberini documents.⁵⁷⁵ Della Cornia was also active as a dealer and he was known to Cardinal Mazarin, to whom he supplied paintings in 1634, and in 1638 a copy of a Correggio Madonna. Della Cornia was responsible for the 1633 inventory of the Ludovisi collection (see below p.131), as well as that of the collection of Vittorio Amedeo I di Savoia in Turin in 1635, where he recorded seven copies of paintings by Correggio, including one copy of the *Mystic Marriage of St. Catherine*. The original [Louvre] was acquired by Cardinal Antonio Barberini in 1624 from the collection of Cardinal Sforza and copies of it were much desired, but access was strictly controlled.⁵⁷⁶ Della Cornia himself was known to have copied this work and one of his copies ‘dall’originale del Correggia [sic]’ appears in the 1695 inventory of the dal Pozzo collection.⁵⁷⁷ It is not possible to ascertain the date of its acquisition and the statement that ‘it is highly unlikely that the arrangements of the collections in Cassiano’s lifetime differed substantially from that recorded in the inventory taken...in 1689’ is not wholly accepted here.⁵⁷⁸ Arrangements over more than thirty years, Cassiano having died in 1657, are more likely than not to have changed.

In 1767, the French connoisseur Pierre-Jean Mariette was still aware of della Cornia’s reputation as a copyist, when making some personal notes in his copy of the catalogue of the sale of the famous Jullienne collection. He recalled there that his friend had paid too much for a *St. John in the Desert* attributed to Raphael, which Mariette thought likely to be by della Cornia, based on his reading of an early eighteenth century account of della Cornia’s career.⁵⁷⁹ This artist is known to have made such a copy, which was given by ‘un Principe Romano’ to ‘un Principe d’Altezza’, the latter believing it to be the original and it

⁵⁷⁴ *Diary*, II, pp.223, 399. The other two were: ‘*Pietro de Cortone*, Monsieur Poussine a French man’ . Evelyn’s editor, E.S. de Beer, is incorrect in stating in a footnote that ‘no works by him [Cornia] are now known to exist’, as there are several original paintings by della Cornia in S. Maria dell’Umiltà, Rome.

⁵⁷⁵ Lavin op. cit. p.510.

⁵⁷⁶ Di Macco, M., ‘Note su Antonio Mariani detto della Corgna...’, in *Studi in onore di Giulio Carlo Argan*, Florence, 1994, pp. 192-217, 192.

⁵⁷⁷ Spati, D.L., ‘The dal Pozzo Collection again: The Inventories of 1689 and 1695 and the Family Archive’, *BM*, 132, 1990, pp.551-570, 566.

⁵⁷⁸ Spati op. cit. p. 553.

⁵⁷⁹ Kopp, E., and J. Tonkovich, ‘The judgment of a connoisseur: P-J. Mariette’s annotations to the 1767 Jullienne sale catalogue: part I paintings’, *BM*, CLI, 2009, pp. 821-824 and online appendix. no. 3.

was praised to the stars by all the best artists.⁵⁸⁰ However, della Cornia, being known to the Prince, was then shown the painting and revealed that it was his copy by showing the Prince where to find his monogram on the painting.⁵⁸¹ In 1633, the Duc de Créquy received what was alleged to be the original work as a gift from the duke di San Gemini, but this does not appear in his death inventory of 1638.⁵⁸² It is therefore possible that this is the work seen by Mariette in 1767 and described as a Cornia copy, but he was not aware of the gift to Créquy.

Evelyn did not record the name of the copyist who made him a copy of a painting seen at Palazzo Barberini: 'the Sposaliccio of St. Sebastiano, the original of Hanibal Carracio, of which I procured a Copy, little inferior to the prototype; a table in my judgement Superior to anything I had seene in Rome'.⁵⁸³ This rather confused account appears to concern the *Mystic Marriage of St. Catherine* by Correggio in the Palazzo Barberini referred to above, in which the figure of St. Sebastian unusually also appears as a witness, which later passed to Cardinal Mazarin [Louvre]. Mary Beal is incorrect in describing it as a painting by Annibale Carracci, although Symonds did very much admire such a painting, which does not include St. Sebastian, during his visit to Palazzo Farnese (not Palazzo Barberini).⁵⁸⁴ Posner records the original painting, but is mistaken in stating that Symonds was in Rome in 1635, a statement which he repeats elsewhere.⁵⁸⁵ According to E.S. de Beer's footnote, such a copy survived at Evelyn's former home and was attributed to Carlo Maratta.⁵⁸⁶ It has not been possible to trace this. Evelyn either mixed up the names of Annibale Carracci and Antonio Allegri da Correggio or perceived in some of Annibale's paintings the well-known influence of Correggio and this led to the confusion. It may be worth considering the possibility that his copy could have been by della Cornia, rather than Maratta.

The copying "shop" form of employment has been described as that of 'urban hacks...who might grind out large numbers of inferior copies as their principal trade'.⁵⁸⁷ In the early eighteenth century, Watteau's contemporaries record his early Parisian employment as

⁵⁸⁰ Di Macco op. cit. p.216; author's translation.

⁵⁸¹ Di Macco op. cit. p.217.

⁵⁸² Di Macco op. cit. p.192.

⁵⁸³ *Diary*, II, p.229.

⁵⁸⁴ Beal, p.60, Brookes 1998 p.142.

⁵⁸⁵ Posner op. cit., cat. 32.

⁵⁸⁶ *Diary*, II, p.229.

⁵⁸⁷ Moir, op.cit., p.9.

being in a copying “shop”, with a personal specialisation in ‘rendering Saint Nicholas’. These were copies in oil, partly done from memory.⁵⁸⁸

However, student artists might also have been employed in this way, before moving on to doing original works. In December, 1839, the Duke of Wellington expressed his irritation that artists of his day did ‘not do as their predecessors have. Why not copy from each other? I answer, their confounded vanity prevents it.’⁵⁸⁹ The Duke commissioned notable copies [Appendix IV, type A.2] of four paintings by Raphael: *Madonna with the Fish*, *The Visitation*, *La Perla* and *Lo Spasimo di Sicilia* from Féréol Bonnemaïson which were delivered to Wellington in 1818 [all on display at Apsley House]. This commission was made in the context of the return to Madrid of the original works, which had been removed by Joseph Bonaparte and displayed in the Musée Napoleon, where they were transferred from panel to canvas.⁵⁹⁰

Annibale Carracci is most frequently noted as a copyist of works by Raphael and Correggio and numerous references to these are found in the inventories of the Palazzo Farnese. In the inventory of 1644 are listed [no. 3122]: ‘Due quadri compagni, grandi, in tela, cornice dorate, dentro figure ignude che rappresentano le Virtù, copiate dall’opere di Raffaele d’Orbino nelle loggie de’ Ghisi da Annibale Caracci’, with almost the identical description in the inventory of 1653. (This is a reference to the loggia at the Villa Chigi [now Farnesina]; Evelyn called it “Gichi” in February, 1645, on his second visit).⁵⁹¹ The entry in the 1644 inventory [no. 3215] for ‘Un quadro grande con cornice dorata dentro la Madonna su le nubi, copiata da Annibale Caracci dall’opera del Correggio’ is also recorded in 1653 and this may be that seen by Symonds in 1650, although there was also another very similar-sounding painting.⁵⁹² Although described as a work by Parmigianino in both inventories, the ‘mezzo puttino che legge una carta d’alfabeto’ (1644 no. 4273 and 1653 no. 228), this is, as noted by Jestaz, a single figure extracted from *The Education of Cupid* by Correggio [National Gallery] with his wings removed; this is a variant (Appendix IV,

⁵⁸⁸ ‘3 heads a day’ Gersaint 1744 quoted in Rosenberg, op. cit.; some influence of this early employment may be reflected in Watteau’s practice of taking oil counterproofs of parts of his paintings, but not always of the finished versions (Seminar at the National Gallery by C.M. Vogtherr 9/7/09).

⁵⁸⁹ Jenkins, S., ‘Sir Thomas Lawrence and the Duke of Wellington: A portraitist and his sitter’, *BAJ*, 8, 1, 2007, pp. 63-67. Wellington, a notoriously impatient sitter, but knowledgeable collector, refers here to portrait painters, not history painters.

⁵⁹⁰ These copies are nos. 10, 11, 12 and 13 in the *Catalogue of Paintings in the Wellington Museum, Apsley House*, revised edition 2009. Bonnemaïson also acted as Wellington’s agent at auctions of paintings in Paris.

⁵⁹¹ *Diary*, II, p. 357.

⁵⁹² Jestaz; Bertini p. 220; as noted by Brookes 2007 p. 123, n. 139.

type J). This raises the question of when and where the anonymous copyist had had access to this work, originally painted for a private collection in Mantua, subsequently acquired by the Gonzaga and purchased by Charles I in 1628, together with its pendant *Jupiter and Antiope* [Louvre] (see Chapter Three, p.207). None of the works identified as originals by Raphael in the 1644 inventory is thus identified today.⁵⁹³ It seems probable that copies attributed to Annibale Carracci were recorded in these inventories because he had become such a famous artist by the time those inventories were taken. Symonds' notes refer to some of the numerous copies in the Farnese collection, but it is clear that he did not have access to the entire collection. The inventories taken in 1644 and 1653 reveal that these copies were displayed together with autograph works in the main rooms of the palace.⁵⁹⁴ They do not correctly identify all the copies in that collection, however, as Marcello Venusti's copy [Capodimonte] of Michelangelo's *Last Judgement* is listed as 'mano di Michelangelo Bonarota' and the inventory taker should have been aware of the location of the original fresco [Sistine Chapel].⁵⁹⁵

Some painters were professional copyists, either full-time or part-time and Louis Finson, Angelo Caroselli (1585-1652), Nicolas Regnier and Jean Lhomme all fall into the latter category in the seventeenth century. Most of these copyists were foreigners working in Rome.⁵⁹⁶ Caroselli was the exception, as he was a native Roman; his variant (Appendix IV, type K) after Nicolas Poussin's *The Plague at Ashdod* [Caroselli in NG, Poussin in Louvre] provides some evidence of the practice of making copies in Rome.⁵⁹⁷ The principal difference between the original and the variant is in the background architecture, which may reflect the possibility that the original was incomplete when Caroselli began his copy; the figures are very closely replicated and there is clear evidence of tracing. Whether Poussin gave his permission for this copy actually to be made in his studio is not certain, although it seems unlikely. The collector in this instance, Fabrizio Valguarnera, a minor Sicilian nobleman convicted of complicity in theft, who died in the notorious Roman prison, the Tor di Nona, owned both the original and Caroselli's variant of it.⁵⁹⁸ What is unusual in this case is that Valguarnera clearly owned several copies which he had

⁵⁹³ Jestaz nos. 4276, 4280, 4281, 4282, 4455, 4456, 6657, 4284.

⁵⁹⁴ Jestaz op. cit., Bertini op. cit.

⁵⁹⁵ Jestaz no. 4245; Bertini no.182.

⁵⁹⁶ Moir, op.cit., pp.9,71.

⁵⁹⁷ Recently on display in the exhibition *Close Examination* [NG]; there was no exhibition catalogue, although some material was available online.

⁵⁹⁸ Wine, H., *The Seventeenth Century French Paintings*, National Gallery Catalogue, 2001, pp.16-23; NG 2010 exhibition information online.

commissioned very soon after the first version, or indeed when the first version was still incomplete; some of these were commissioned from the original artist, but others, as in the case of the Caroselli, were not.⁵⁹⁹ It is clear from this episode that there was a sophisticated art market in Rome and that prices were based on a variety of carefully considered factors; Valguarnera testified during his trial that he had paid 110 scudi to “Monsù Posi” (Poussin) for the original of the *Plague* and 35 scudi to Caroselli for the copy.⁶⁰⁰ These are not, of course, auction prices, but those paid direct to the artists concerned, but do reveal a fairly typical relationship of 3:1 between original and copy, as shown by De Marchi and van Miegroet.⁶⁰¹

Caroselli, like Claude, was at one time associated with the workshop of Agostino Tassi and he may be the “Angelo Caratelli” mentioned in a letter from Humphrey Weld to Peter Fitton about the acquisition of paintings in 1647.⁶⁰² Some of the paintings owned by Valguarnera were publicly exhibited in 1631 or 1632 at the church of S. Maria di Constantinopoli, Rome, [demolished] in a display which included original works by Guercino, Valentin de Boulogne and Sandrart and copies of works by Pietro da Cortona (*The Rape of the Sabines* [Capitoline]), Andrea Sacchi, Guido Reni and Domenichino, some of which belonged to Cardinal Bernardino Spada (already mentioned above). It is curious that, as noted by Jane Costello, Sandrart’s account of it makes no mention of the copies which were evidently included in this event, either because he could not tell copies from originals, or, possibly because he wanted to enhance the status of his own painting (either the *Death of Cato* or the *Death of Seneca*). Symonds saw the original of the Cortona still in the Sacchetti collection during his visit, when he also noted Cortona’s copy [now Accademia di S. Luca, Rome] of Raphael’s *Galatea* fresco [Farnesina].⁶⁰³ Symonds also saw a public display of paintings at the Pantheon in 1650, when amongst the paintings in the portico was the triple portrait of Charles I by van Dyck.⁶⁰⁴

Despite the large numbers of paintings acquired by English collectors in Venice, it was Rome that was the true centre of artistic production of copies and the dissemination of copies in the first half of the seventeenth century. Many English visitors avoided Rome

⁵⁹⁹ Costello op. cit., pp. 262, 272.

⁶⁰⁰ Ibid.

⁶⁰¹ De Marchi and van Miegroet, 1996, p.55.

⁶⁰² Cavazzini 2004 p. 142; Ferris, J.P., ‘A Connoisseur’s Shopping-List, 1647’, *JWCI*, 38, 1975, pp.339-41.

⁶⁰³ Brookes 2007 p.112.

⁶⁰⁴ Brookes 2007, p.25.

because of fears of the Inquisition, but the city still played a seminal role as illustrated by the comments of Nicholas Stone Junior, Richard Symonds and John Evelyn.

Amongst other notable collectors making acquisitions in Rome was the Maréchal de Créquy; as already noted, he was the recipient of a copy from the Barberini, but he also commissioned copies in Rome. Créquy as ambassador of France was in Rome from June 1633 to July 1634. His death inventory of 1638 lists 1,633 paintings and seven drawings and was assessed by the painters Charles Carrette and Claude Vignon. The practice of artists carrying out assessments of this type was much more common in France and Spain than in England. Most of the artists listed in Créquy's inventory are contemporary Romans or members of the Bolognese School. Despite this extensive documentation, some original works known to have belonged to Créquy are not included, including two paintings by Poussin. Jean Lhomme's will of 30th December 1633 records his activities in copying paintings for Créquy in Rome by Veronese, Titian and Correggio. Créquy also appears to have employed the noted copyists Antonio della Cornia and Cavaliere d'Arpino at least as his advisors, as well as commissioning copies from the French painter Charles Errard after Titian. The Créquy inventory includes a large painting of the *Death of Dido* which is probably a copy of the Guercino owned by Cardinal Bernardino Spada referred to above and he also owned a copy on panel of a Magdalene 'couchée' by Correggio (see Chapter Three pp.179-180). The latter may have been one of the copies referred to in Lhomme's will. The extent of Créquy's genuine commitment to art has been questioned, versus his desire to enhance his status and compete with the Spanish ambassador in Rome.⁶⁰⁵

Daniel Fröschl was appointed court painter and miniaturist to Rudolf II in Prague in 1603 and is said to have been 'mostly engaged in copying pictures'.⁶⁰⁶ Michael Cross (or Michel de la Croix or Miguel de la Cruz; his nationality has not been satisfactorily established) acted in this capacity in Madrid on behalf of Charles I, copying the Titians in the Spanish royal collection (see Chapter Three, pp.185-6).

This took place shortly after Rubens had been making copies of those works by Titian, but for the great Flemish artist this was not paid work, but something he undertook for his own

⁶⁰⁵ Boyer, J-C., and I. Volf, 'Rome à Paris: les tableaux du maréchal de Créquy (1638)' in *Revue de l'Art*, 79, 1988, pp.22-41.

⁶⁰⁶ Springell, p.243.

satisfaction during his extended visit to Madrid in 1628-9 on diplomatic mission. Perhaps Rubens felt that it was one way of keeping his hand in while he had no official commissions to execute. Rubens was certainly active as a copyist, producing full-scale copies of works by Titian and reduced copies of works by Caravaggio, in particular. The organisation of his own workshop, numbers of assistants employed and the actual extent of Rubens's own participation in finished works, whether signed or not, continues to be the subject of discussion. It was already an issue in his lifetime, as revealed by the correspondence with Dudley Carleton (see Appendix IV, type F).

Signatures and authenticity

Copyists very rarely identified their copies of other artists' works, presumably partly because collectors would not wish for their signatures to be visible and clearly where there was an intention to deceive this would be a prerequisite. Signatures on genuine works, especially 'large expensive' works in 'relatively public spaces' would enhance the artist's reputation; they seem to be more common after 1500.⁶⁰⁷ It has been suggested that through signatures artists seek 'to direct...appreciation of their artistry' and that on altarpieces they may be a representation of the artist's 'offerings to the glory of God', although the possibilities for "advertising" in such a location seem to the present writer to outweigh such pious considerations.⁶⁰⁸ Titian frequently signed or inscribed works which were sent away from Venice, which may have been prompted by a desire to assert the autograph status of these works in locations where they were under greater threat of the attentions of the unscrupulous. However, he also prominently signed works which were almost entirely executed by his workshop, as did Giovanni Bellini. Signatures also seem to be more frequently used by artists operating in an open marketplace, rather than among court artists, but very often function as a corporate signature for the whole workshop.⁶⁰⁹ Signatures could also be copied as in the famous case of Marcantonio Raimondi reproducing Durer's woodcut *Life of the Virgin*.⁶¹⁰ The "signature" of the Spanish court painter, Juan Pantoja de la Cruz, on the first version of the Somerset House Conference

⁶⁰⁷ Matthew, L.C., 'The Painter's Presence: Signatures in Venetian Renaissance Pictures', *AB*, 80, 1998, pp. 616-646, 620.

⁶⁰⁸ Rubin, P., 'Signposts of Invention: Artists' Signatures in Italian Renaissance Art', *AH*, 29, 4, 2006, pp.563-599, 564, 566.

⁶⁰⁹ Matthew, op. cit. p.622.

⁶¹⁰ Rubin, 2006, p.571.

painting [c. 1604, NPG] has been demonstrated to be a fake, although probably applied quite early in the painting's history.⁶¹¹

Even when there was no initial intention to deceive, an unsigned copy could quickly assume the status of a genuine work by the original artist simply through its transmission from one generation or collection to another. It has been suggested that the placement of seals on the backs of pictures was to prevent the substitution of a 'cheap' copy by 'the bankers in charge of the transport' whilst the original was in transit, but this comment only dates from 1691.⁶¹² Unusually, there is a seal on the front of Giovanni Bellini's exceptionally large altarpiece *Coronation of the Virgin* [1473-6, Pesaro Museo Civico]. It has been suggested that the great size of this painting would have necessitated its transportation by sea and subsequent erection on site.⁶¹³ Those paintings formerly in the collection of the Giustiniani brothers now in Potsdam which have not been relined also have seals on the backs.⁶¹⁴ Cardinal Benedetto's pictures were moved to and from Bologna when he was Papal Legate there, but in the case of Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani the pictures are unlikely to have been frequently moved. Some seals survive on paintings from the collection of the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm, a collection which was moved from Brussels to Vienna. On balance, this evidence does not seem conclusive with regard to possible substitutions.

Sculpted Copies

'Studio replication of certain images has...formed an integral part of workshop practice certainly since the seventeenth century. In sixteenth-century Italy, it is often difficult to know whether bronze or clay reductions of sculpture were made in the master's studio or represent a widespread form of piracy'; here, Anthony Hughes was referring to the contemporaneous reproduction of sculpture, rather than the replication of antique precedents.⁶¹⁵ Both these forms of copy were acceptable to seventeenth-century collectors and in Britain various examples could be found, including the gift of some casts by Pietro Tacca after Giambologna, which were sent to Henry, Prince of Wales in 1612.⁶¹⁶ Charles

⁶¹¹ *Talking Peace in 1604*, exhibition at Somerset House, 2004 and accompanying leaflet.

⁶¹² Kitson, *Liber Veritatis*, p.35.

⁶¹³ Humfrey, P., *The Altarpiece in Renaissance Venice*, 1993, p.144.

⁶¹⁴ Squarzina, op. cit., p.778.

⁶¹⁵ Hughes, op. cit., p.32.

⁶¹⁶ Lightbown, 1989, p.67.

I's collection included the full-scale bronzes made for him by Le Sueur, which originally stood in the gardens at St. James's Palace on specially-made bases, such as the bronze replica of the Borghese Gladiator [Windsor Castle]. Charles I also owned two closely similar-sounding versions of a sculpture of Cupid, one of which is usually assumed to be that by Michelangelo referred to above, while the other may have been the antique one attributed to Praxiteles formerly in the grotto of Isabella de'Este; there was also a bronze version by Fanelli.⁶¹⁷ Later in the century, academies trained their students by making them copy (in two dimensions) casts of antique sculpture and 'to defer to its absolute authority', although there was increasing use of engravings and reduced copies (the latter preferred by Hogarth).⁶¹⁸

Where copies were displayed and how they were understood

Information about the display of paintings and the positions occupied by copies, can sometimes be obtained from inventories, providing that the compilers proceeded from room to room, rather than making a list by type of object. Seventeenth-century Italian inventories are generally quite informative about their contents, unlike English inventories (see Chapter Three), as they frequently include names of artists, measurements, frame descriptions and identify the copies in those collections. Some are exceptional, such as the Aldobrandini inventory of 1603, which whilst generally excluding precise measurements, gives plentiful information on the paintings in the collection, sometimes describing their frames.⁶¹⁹ This collection is today inevitably better known for the quality of original works it once contained, than for the presence of copies. The exceptional nature of the information contained in this inventory undoubtedly reflects the presence in the household of Cardinal Aldobrandini as major-domo of Monsignor Giovanni Battista Agucchi, (mentioned above p.84), whose name appears at the beginning of the inventory. The main part of the inventory includes at no. 46 'una copia d'un Christo, che predica nel Tempio cavata dall'originale di Titiano', as well as at no. 123 'L'Annuntiata di Fiorenza...di mano commune' (without actually stating that it is a copy, although it must have been, as the original is a fresco) and even goes so far as to suggest that the Madonna at no. 176 is 'di

⁶¹⁷ Howarth, D., 'Charles I, Sculpture and Sculptors', in *The Late King's Goods*, op. cit., pp.73-113; *Sale*, p.140.

⁶¹⁸ Postle, M., 'Naked Authority? Reproducing Antique Statuary in the English Academy from Lely to Haydon' in *Sculpture and its Reproductions*, op. cit., pp.79-99.

⁶¹⁹ Transcribed in *Domenichino, 1581-1641*, exh. cat. Rome, 1996, pp.567-571.

mano di allievi di Raffaello d'Urbino'. The possibility of doubt regarding authorship is not excluded, for example, no. 332 is 'che si crede di mano del Cotignola' or no. 334 'di mano incerta'. A further 28 paintings feature at the end of the inventory as 'Pitture Copiate'; in two instances the location of the original is mentioned (nos. 1 and 2), in no case is the name of the copyist given, while in two cases doubt is expressed: no. 5 'copia secondo alcuni di Raffaello, et altri di Titiano', no. 27 'si crede sia una copia del Frangia'. No. 46 from the main inventory reappears without a number here, noting its first appearance as an error. In the list of copies, the artists whose works have been copied are almost exclusively sixteenth-century masters: there are six copies after Raphael, four after Titian and Correggio, two each for Michelangelo and Sebastiano del Piombo. Three of these artists are amongst those most frequently copied encountered in this thesis. This document was evidently drawn up by someone with a clear understanding of the collection and a desire for as much accuracy as possible, for example by segregating the copies in a separate section, whilst not excluding the possibility of doubt.

The inventory taken in 1623 of Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi's collection at the Vigna di Porta Pinciana, also contains frequent references to the manner in which the paintings were framed; there were relatively few identified copies present and the copyists were not named, although some of this information can be found in other later documents, which reveal the commissioning of copies of a Manfredi *Fortune Teller* and a *Lucrezia Romana* (original artist unidentified).⁶²⁰ One of the copies appears to be a miniature copy of a Raphael *Madonna and Child with S. Anne and St. John the Baptist* (no.[43]), in a particularly fine frame, which is also listed in 1633 [142] and a copy of a Parmigianino with very similar subject matter [99], which does not reappear in the later inventory. The 1633 inventory of this collection taken by Antonio della Cornia uses language encountered elsewhere in Roman inventories, such as 'di mano incerta'.⁶²¹ In some cases the expression 'viene da' indicates a copy by an unknown copyist, in contrast to the certainty of 'di mano di'. Cornia's 1633 inventory describes a *Galatea* after Raphael, copied by 'Caracci' [3], which appears to be a copy of the fresco in the Villa Chigi [later Farnesina]; this was previously listed in the 1623 inventory but without attribution.⁶²² If this is correct, it resembles the works seen in Palazzo Farnese by Symonds in 1650, which were also copies

⁶²⁰ Wood, C.H., 'The Ludovisi collection of paintings in 1623', *BM*, 1992, pp. 515-523.

⁶²¹ Garas, 1967a, II, p.344.

⁶²² Wood, C.H., p.519; Garas, 1967a, II, p.339.

from the same original source, attributed to Carracci (already discussed). Della Cornia's own career as a copyist (discussed above) must have been of assistance to him in his task.

The inventory of the paintings in Cardinal Scipione Borghese's collection, mentioned above, which is dateable between 1615 and 1630, reveals only ten copies out of 355 paintings.⁶²³ Particularly noticeable in this inventory, unlike most others, is the remarkable number of cases in which the painter is described as "incerto", a total of 66 out of 355. Only one of these is noted as a copy: '226. Un quadro della visitatione di s.ta Elisabetta con molte figure....Copia del Salviati. Incerto'. Four of the copies are by "Gioseppino" (d'Arpino) after works by Titian, although the brief descriptions of the subject matter do not make identification of the originals easy. Useful comparisons can be made with Symonds' notes from his visit in 1650, which reveal that the paintings had been moved from the positions given in the 1615-30 inventory. Anne Brookes, in her analysis of his Roman notebooks, already mentioned, doubted Symonds' citation of Veronese as the painter of a painting of Lot and his daughters, but that is indeed the attribution given in the 1615-30 inventory.⁶²⁴ A painting of 'Solomone by Valentino' previously bore an attribution to Guercino, although neither is now accepted.⁶²⁵ It is curious that the painter Canini, Symonds' usual companion and a former pupil of Domenichino, was not better informed about this picture.

Few English seventeenth-century commentators have much to say about how to display paintings, but there are two notable exceptions. Henry Wotton in 1624 does not mention copies, but does recommend a particular approach to display:

‘That no *Roome* bee furnished with too many [pictures], which in truth were a *Surfet* of *Ornament*, unlesse they bee *Galleries*, or some peculiar *Repository* for *Rarities* of Art. Next, That the best *Pieces* be placed...where there are the *fewest Lights*...That in the placing there be some Care also taken, how the *Painter* did stand in the *Working*...so as *Italian Pieces* will appeare best in a *Roome* where the *Windowes* are high...That they bee as properly bestowed for their Quality, as fitly for their *Grace*, that is *chearefull* Paintings in *Feasting*

⁶²³ Corradini, op. cit.

⁶²⁴ Corradini, op. cit., p.451.

⁶²⁵ Brookes, 2007, pp.79,119, n.47; Corradini p.454.

and *Banquetting Roomes*; *Graver Stories* in Galleries, *Land schips*, and *Boscage* and such *wilde Workes* in open *Tarraces*, or in *Summer Houses*'.⁶²⁶

William Sanderson in *Graphice* plagiarises much of this, but is particularly careful to advise against displaying a portrait of the wife of the collector in public rooms 'lest...an *Italian-minded* Guest gaze too long on them', as well as to 'forbear *Obscene* Pictures...*Jupiter-scapes* in severall *Shapes*, though often done by rare Artists'.⁶²⁷ The reference to Jupiter comes close to describing some of the paintings owned by Charles I, such as the Correggio *Jupiter and Antiope* or Titian's *Venus del Pardo* (the latter also represented by a full-scale copy at Ham House) [originals both Louvre].

In March 1644 John Evelyn's diary records his visit to the Palace in the rue de Seine of Roger du Plessis de Liancourt, due de la Roche-Guyon, where his host was so pleased to show off his collection that he made the duchess leave her dressing room prematurely in order to show 'the Curiosities and Pictures in it'. Unfortunately, Evelyn does not say what they were. Otherwise, this is an unusually full description which gives the room locations and in some cases the position of paintings within the room: 'over the Chimny' or 'over the dore' and there are detailed attributions such as: 'sayd to be of Mich : Angelo' or 'A Madona after Titian, & a St. Magdalen of the same hand as the Count esteemes it', evidently an expression of doubt. In this case, 'Mich:Angelo' almost certainly refers to the portrait of Alof de Wignacourt and his page by Caravaggio [Louvre]. The Liancourt collection would have been of particular interest to Evelyn because Charles I had given Liancourt, formerly ambassador to London, a Holbein portrait of Erasmus [Louvre] in exchange for the Leonardo *St John the Baptist*, said to have belonged to the king of France [Louvre]. According to van der Doort, the king also gave Liancourt a 'Tichin, being our Lady and Christ and St. John half figures as bigg as the life...given...by my lord of Carlile who had it of Docto^r Dunn', as noted by Evelyn 'A Madona of Titian very rare given him also by our King Charles the first'.⁶²⁸ The king must have prized the Leonardo very highly indeed to have parted with a work by his favourite artist, Titian, but the scarcity of securely attributed works by Leonardo must have persuaded him it was worthwhile. Charles I,

⁶²⁶ *The Elements of Architecture: Collected by Henry Wotton, Knight from the best Authors and Examples* 1624.

⁶²⁷ Sanderson, W., *Graphice: The use of the Pen and Pensil...*, 1658, p.27.

⁶²⁸ Van der Doort p.89; *Diary*, II, pp. 112-114.

while Prince of Wales, is known to have purchased a book of drawings of portraits of famous Frenchmen from Liancourt.⁶²⁹ The descriptions given by Evelyn such as ‘an excellent Paynting of Pussine’ and ‘4 of Paulo Brill, the skyes a little too blew’ may suggest that among his companions was someone very well informed about contemporary European painting, possibly rather better than Evelyn himself, who is generally less reliable about paintings than Symonds. This person may have been the painter Hendrick van der Borch, who was closely associated with Arundel.⁶³⁰ Although he is not mentioned at this time in the Diary, Evelyn later noted Roger Pratt as being his ‘fellow traveller’, particularly in Rome.⁶³¹

Richard Symonds notebooks from his visit to Paris in 1649 include descriptions of the arrangements of paintings at the Louvre and the Palais du Luxembourg, but he makes no comment upon the hang, while on the other hand, he does comment on the merits of some of the paintings he saw. In the Chapel at Port Royal he noted the altarpiece of the *Last Supper* by Philippe de Champaigne [there are three surviving versions], obtaining the name of the artist from another painter who was copying it and also noting the fine “border of grape worke, guilt and exquisitely polisht”.⁶³² His only reservation about this picture was that it was under life-size. The version of the *Last Supper* seen by Symonds was probably de Champaigne’s own second version of the original painted for the Parisian church of Port Royal, but there were other replicas.⁶³³ Presumably the unnamed copyist of de Champaigne’s altarpiece had obtained special permission to make his copy.

Symonds had to request the name of the artist of this altarpiece at Port Royal, which raises the question of how viewers knew what exactly they were seeing. In her transcript (2007) of Symonds’ Roman notebooks, Brookes states that he identified the painters of the pictures and which of them were copies by someone else on the basis of labels, particularly at Palazzo Borghese where she says that his ‘notes indicate that he used the Borghese labelling’.⁶³⁴ This is a misunderstanding, based on the fact that occasionally the sitters in portraits were specifically identified. In some instances, it seems that Symonds studied

⁶²⁹ *The Late King’s Goods*, p. 121.

⁶³⁰ Darley, G., *John Evelyn: Living for Ingenuity*, 2006, p.41.

⁶³¹ Chaney, E., ‘Evelyn, Inigo Jones, and the Collector Earl of Arundel’ in *John Evelyn and His Milieu: Essays* edited by F. Harris and M. Hunter, 2003, pp.37-60, letter of 20.1.1666.

⁶³² Millar, O., ‘An Exile in Paris: The Notebooks of Richard Symonds’ in *Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art Presented to Anthony Blunt on his 60th Birthday*, London, 1967, pp.157-164.

⁶³³ *Philippe de Champaigne 1602-1674: Entre politique et devotion*, exh. cat. Lille 2007, no. 43.

⁶³⁴ Brookes, 2007, pp.29, 78.

these collections with his copy of Baglione in hand, while on other occasions he was accompanied by the painter Canini, as well as members of household staff. Although the modern viewer expects labels everywhere, even in churches, so that the “Mays” (altarpieces) in Notre Dame, Paris, described by Symonds in 1649 now have labels, this was clearly not the case in the seventeenth century (or the eighteenth century). Where Symonds saw that the paintings were all originals, he evidently considered this worthy of note: ‘not a Coppy in all this Roome, being very large & lofty’, during his visit to Palazzo Borghese.⁶³⁵ It was common for the sitter in a portrait to be identified in some way, either, as is often the case with English sitters, by way of an inscription on the painting, or, as in the case of Paolo Giovio’s biographical collection, by way of an inscription on the frame, although such inscriptions are not always entirely reliable. Symonds carefully noted ‘a small Ritratto of Francisco Petrarcha by Raphael so written under y^e picture’, presumably because this was unusual [Galleria Borghese].⁶³⁶ These inscriptions are likely to be an indication that there were no labels on the frames. John Aubrey regretted that ‘in noblemen’s galleries the names are not writ on or behind the pictures’.⁶³⁷ If they had been “behind” it is difficult to know how visitors would have gained access to this information. Occasionally, paintings were framed in sets. In the Ludovisi inventory of 1603, mentioned above, four paintings listed consecutively were no. 315 ‘di mano di Annibale Caracci [sic]’, framed ‘con cornice dorata’ and nos. 316 and 317 ‘della med.ma mano con cornice simile’, whilst 318 had the same type of frame and was ‘dell’istesso Caracci’, suggesting that they may have been intended to be viewed as a “set”; all had religious subject matter. In contrast, the next three in the list, although all attributed to Guido Reni, had different frames. Prints from the first two decades of the seventeenth century show generic oval frames with flat edges, on which lettering identifying the sitter frequently appears, but these cannot be considered accurate representations of actual frames. In the 1650s, for example in prints by Lombart, representations of frames on portraits appear to resemble reality and none has any space for a label, which is no doubt the reason why they have lengthy inscriptions in blank spaces below the frames.⁶³⁸ It was unknown for the subject matter of history paintings to be identified in this way, or for their painters to be indicated other than by signature and copies are seldom signed, although Penni did sign and date a copy of

⁶³⁵ Brookes, 2007, p.81.

⁶³⁶ Brookes, 2007 p.80.

⁶³⁷ Quoted by M. Edmond, *Life of N. Hilliard*, ODNB.

⁶³⁸ For example, Lombart after Robert Walker, *The Print in Stuart Britain 1603-1689*, exh. cat., London, 1998, cat. 116.

Raphael's *Entombment*, possibly because he had been a member of the workshop.⁶³⁹

Examination of surviving early frames, such as those at Ham House or the uniform series in the Gemäldegalerie in Dresden (1747-52), show that there is no space on them which would permit the application of such information. Some, but not all, of the depictions by David Teniers II of the collection of Archduke Leopold Wilhelm show the artists' names on the frames, but certainly not the subject matter (see below pp.140-141).⁶⁴⁰ Individual frames even on portraits such as those on Cornelius Johnson's portrait of Thomas Coventry, 1st Baron Coventry [1639, NPG], van Dyck's last self-portrait (ill. 9 - on the market July, 2010) or on John Hayls' portrait of Samuel Pepys [1666, NPG], similarly lack any available space for labelling.⁶⁴¹ Originally, the double portrait of *Endymion Porter and Van Dyck* [Prado] was framed almost identically to the frame seen in ill. 9, as evidenced by its replication in a tapestry copy [private collection, England]. Even in the case of a collection in which inventory numbers were painted onto the surface of the pictures, which was common practice, as for example in the Borghese collection, unless a visitor were permitted to view the collection with that inventory in his hand, which seems unlikely, he would be none the wiser.⁶⁴² It is clear that Symonds was not making use of the 1644 Farnese inventory, as his descriptions frequently deviate from those given in that document.

Visitors might be shown a collection by the steward or "wardrobe master", either in the absence of the owner or in cases where the status of the viewer precluded the participation of that owner. Bellori describes the special treatment accorded by Duke Francesco de' Medici to Barocci, when the duke pretended to be the wardrobe master and showed his collection; according to Bellori this was in order to hear the artist's comments for himself.⁶⁴³ The latter is likely to be another trope. However, when William Harvey visited Florence in September 1636 the Grand Duke 'shewd me him self many of his rarities...[saying] there was nothing in his court or power that was not at the K of England his service', as Harvey reported in a letter to Feilding in Venice.⁶⁴⁴ When Henry Stone and Nicholas Stone II, sons of the sculptor and master mason Nicolas Stone, were in Florence

⁶³⁹ Moir notes that the only signed copies of Caravaggio's works are by non-Italian artists, op. cit., p.6; Shearman, *Raphael*, p.867.

⁶⁴⁰ For example, one of these in the Musée des Beaux Arts, Brussels, inv. 2569. This example is not illustrated in *David Teniers and the Theatre of Painting*, exh. cat., Courtauld Gallery, 2006.

⁶⁴¹ Simon, J., *The Art of the Picture Frame: Artists, Patrons and the Framing of Portraits in Britain*, exh. cat., London, 1996.

⁶⁴² For the Borghese inventory numbers see Gould 1970.

⁶⁴³ Bellori, p.164.

⁶⁴⁴ *Eleven Letters of William Harvey to Lord Feilding, June 9-November 15 1636*, London 1912, letter of 7/17 September (unpaginated).

in 1638, the duke found them admiring his collection and took the opportunity to enquire in a friendly manner ‘whether the Kings of England had many rare things, and my Lord of Arundell’.⁶⁴⁵ The general absence of labels must be an explanation for the very limited, often non-existent, descriptions of paintings in most English inventories before that by van der Doort of Charles I’s collection in 1639. Although van der Doort did devise labels for some of Charles I’s paintings, some of which survive in a fragmentary state, these were applied to the backs of the paintings, so would not have been helpful to visitors. When the paintings sent by the Barberini arrived in London in 1636, Panzani had placed ‘the note of the painters’ on them, which Charles I removed in order to test Inigo Jones’s knowledge.⁶⁴⁶ However helpful Panzani had intended to be, the information merely identified the artist and not the subject matter of the paintings. Indeed, the practice in Britain in inventories of simply stating the number of pictures in a room, without any further information, continued even after the 1630s. Viewing paintings, or sculpture, was often something of a challenge to demonstrate one’s classical knowledge, as in the Antonio Lombardo marble sculpture of *Venus Anadyomene* [Victoria & Albert Museum], where only half of the quotation from Ovid is included and the spectator was expected to supply the rest himself.

“Viewing” was often, of course, an imagined experience, necessitated by the wide dispersal of famous works of art across Europe. Commentators were assiduous in demonstrating their knowledge of famous works of art, even ones they had not seen, but which they could safely assume to be known to at least a select group. Vasari’s description of Leonardo’s *Mona Lisa* [Louvre], the original of which he could not have seen as it had gone to France before Vasari’s arrival in Florence, is an example. The details he gives such as ‘the eyebrows...the manner in which the hairs spring from the flesh...could not be more natural’, seem entirely convincing (although modern viewers might note that in its present condition, the eyebrows are notable by their absence).⁶⁴⁷ When Bellori stated that in painting the equestrian portrait of Charles I [National Gallery], van Dyck depicted ‘the king mounted on a horse in imitation of Charles V as represented by Titian, with one of his gentlemen following behind, bearing his helmet’ most modern viewers would appreciate the analogy, but the citation is intended to enhance the intellectual standing of both writer

⁶⁴⁵ Spiers, op. cit., p.163.

⁶⁴⁶ Wood, J., ‘Taste and Connoisseurship at the Court of Charles I: Inigo Jones and the Work of Giulio Romano’ in *The Stuart Courts*, ed. E. Cruickshanks, Stroud, 2000, pp.118-140, 119 [Wood J. 2000a].

⁶⁴⁷ Vasari *Lives*, I, p. 636.

and reader (if they could follow the allusion).⁶⁴⁸ There are as many differences as similarities between these two images and the similarities do not render van Dyck's image a copy. Bellori could not have seen the original van Dyck portrait (Loh p. 142 'standing in front of [it]') and was presumably relying on the information provided to him by Kenlem Digby; the painting when sold in 1650 following the execution of Charles I remained in Northern Europe, until going to Bavaria in 1698.⁶⁴⁹ Bellori could not have seen the original Titian either as he is not known to have visited Spain, where it has been recorded since 1556.⁶⁵⁰ Van Dyck could not have seen the original Titian, but may have seen drawings of it; at present, a contemporary print representing the whole figure, rather than the head only, has not been traced. Rubens painted a copy of the head of the Emperor [Courtauld Gallery] and van Dyck is recorded as having made one also, presumably based on that by Rubens.⁶⁵¹ A copy of the whole painting is referred to in the correspondence of William Trumbull, the English agent to the Spanish Netherlands, when writing to Lord Arundel, but nothing further is known of its whereabouts. There is a reduced copy of poor quality in the Musées Royaux des Beaux Arts, Brussels, but it is of uncertain date and probably not known to van Dyck.⁶⁵² Two half-length portraits of Charles V (after Titian) were recorded in Charles I's collection, but these would not have informed van Dyck about the equestrian portrait in question. However, as Titian was the artist most admired by van Dyck, a taste he shared with his royal master, his painting is undoubtedly intended to be viewed with Titian in mind and, no doubt, some contemporaries derived pleasure from being able to recognise the quotation. Charles I would have seen the original Titian on his visit to Madrid in 1623 (when still Prince of Wales), but others at court who could make the same connection were probably quite limited in number, which would increase their pleasure in demonstrating their connoisseurship. In addition, the cross-references between the two to the concept of the imperial ruler, the Christian knight and the superb horsemanship demonstrated by the rider and, ultimately, back to the equestrian image of Marcus Aurelius in Rome created a multiplicity of meanings which only the most sophisticated viewer could fully appreciate.

⁶⁴⁸ Bellori p. 218. The van Dyck is incorrectly identified in Bellori, p.222, n.53 as the portrait of *Charles I with M. de S. Antoine*. The Titian is in the Prado.

⁶⁴⁹ *Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, eds. S.J. Barnes et al., 2004, Cat. IV.51.

⁶⁵⁰ Wethey, II, no. 21.

⁶⁵¹ Wood, J., 2010, p.41.

⁶⁵² Hill, R., 'Ambassadors and art collecting in early Stuart Britain: the parallel careers of William Trumbull and Sir Dudley Carleton 1609-5', *JoHoC*, 15, 2003, pp.211-228.

Gallery Paintings

This category of paintings has been given little consideration as a type of copy in itself, an aspect which was not discussed in the ground-breaking work of Zirka Filipczak, who first coined the name “gallery paintings”.⁶⁵³ Paintings of this type first appeared at the beginning of the seventeenth century and initially, they were a speciality of Antwerp-based artists and while some are wholly imaginary, others do depict the collections of the *liefhebbers*, or art lovers, in that city. The local Guild of St. Luke created a new category of membership for the *liefhebbers*. These pictures served several purposes, most importantly to display the wealth and good taste of the collector whose collection is apparently depicted and the first practitioner of this type of painting may have been Frans Francken II. The most famous example is the painting by Willem van Haecht [Rubenshuis, Antwerp], which purports to show a visit by the Archdukes Albert and Isabella Clara Eugenia to the collection of Cornelis van der Geest. This painting includes not only the collector, but also Rubens and other distinguished Antwerp residents and visitors. In reality, it is not a depiction of a single moment as it is known that all the persons shown in the painting were not actually present in Antwerp at the time of the painting. It is rather a representation of an “ideal” viewing of a collection, the nature of the occasion being significantly enhanced by the status of those present. As Filipczak observed, the examples which introduce Apelles as protagonist offer the opportunity to raise the status of the artist by representing Alexander the Great as the visitor or observer.⁶⁵⁴ An example of this type by Willem van Haecht is ill. 10. Such paintings cannot be relied upon in themselves as representations either of the hang of collections, nor necessarily as a record of works which were present in Antwerp. The van Haecht example includes works which are not known to have been in Antwerp, unless what he depicted were themselves copies. Thus amongst the works he includes is Correggio’s *Jupiter and Antiope* [Louvre] which in 1628 was on its way from Mantua to the collection of Charles I in London and Titian’s *Blindfolding of Cupid* [Borghese], of which seventeenth-century copies are discussed in this thesis, including one by Padovanino of the Titian. Another Borghese painting included here, directly under the Titian, is the Domenichino *Diana and her Nymphs Hunting*, while Sebastiano del Piombo’s group portrait of *Ferry Carondelet, his secretary and another* [Thyssen], then thought to be by Raphael and in Arundel’s collection (see below) also appears. Van der Doort records the

⁶⁵³ Filipczak, Z.Z., *Picturing Art in Antwerp 1550-1700*, Princeton, 1987.

⁶⁵⁴ Filipczak p. 27.

gift by the Marquess of Hamilton to Charles I of ‘a peece of painting of a Cabbonnett wherein all sorts of painting are painted as if some pictures were hanging at the wall’ by ‘ffrancks’. Despite the fact that van der Doort says it came ‘from Germany’, this reference seems likely to refer to Frans Francken II.⁶⁵⁵ There are also collaborative examples by Jan Brueghel I and Rubens, such as the series of *The Senses* [Prado]. Most such paintings give no indication of the names of the artists or the subject matter of the pictures which are copied within them.

The notable exceptions to this are the paintings which record the collection of the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm by Teniers, of which there are at least eleven extant examples. The list of these works given in the exhibition catalogue *David Teniers and the Theatre of Painting* (2006) is incomplete. Of these, half include very small indications of the names of some of the artists on the frames, but in no case is the subject matter included. Those which include the artists’ names are in the Prado, Munich (both versions), Schliessheim (one version), Museo Lazaro Galdiano, Madrid, that formerly in the Rothschild Collection [sold at Christie’s, London, 1999] and the version in Brussels. The exceptions are the examples at Schliessheim (the version which principally shows royal portraits), Petworth House, one in Brussels, one in the Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna, the version at Woburn Abbey and that formerly in the collection of Lord Brownlow [Swiss private collection]. It is probable that the acquisition by the Archduke of the Hamilton collection prompted the production of these paintings. None of these paintings is identical with another in terms of the paintings within them, or the settings and the personages represented; for example, the Archduke himself does not appear in all the extant versions. As Filipczak pointed out, the positioning and spelling of the names of those artists whose works appear in more than one of the versions of Teniers’ paintings vary, which suggests that the frames he depicts were not the actual ones.⁶⁵⁶ There is a related image at Barnard Castle, which follows the more usual formula of omitting the artists’ names.⁶⁵⁷ Even when the same paintings recur in different versions of Teniers’ image, they do not appear in the same places and the colours of the curtains hanging over them also change; for example in one of the Munich versions, the *St. Margaret* by Raphael and his workshop (already referred to in the discussion of

⁶⁵⁵ Van der Doort, p. 65. Works by both Francken and van Haecht were included in the exhibition *Room for Art* at the Rubenshuis, Antwerp, in 2009.

⁶⁵⁶ Filipczak p. 153.

⁶⁵⁷ Illustrated in colour in *The Treasure Houses of Britain*, exh. cat. Washington, 1985, no.291.

Michael Cross p.80) has a red curtain, while in the Prado version the curtain is blue.⁶⁵⁸ In many cases, the paintings are hung frame to frame and near to large windows with do not appear to have any shutters or curtains, while only a few of the paintings depicted have their own curtains, which had been very common in sixteenth-century collections but were gradually going out of fashion in the seventeenth century.⁶⁵⁹

This chapter has explored a wide variety of different aspects of copying in most media and demonstrated that copies played an essential role in artistic training and the dissemination of ideas. The importance of emulation of certain key masters, as recommended by Cennino and Vasari, continued to be felt in the seventeenth century and this can be demonstrated by the number of eminent artists who were active in this field of artistic endeavour. This chapter has also demonstrated that all major collections studied contained copies and that they were welcomed and sought after, as well as being disseminated across Europe through their use as diplomatic gifts. This period also saw increasing numbers of commentators and connoisseurs, whose opinions in some cases circulated widely. In the next chapter, the ways in which these ideas were adopted by English collectors of copies will be explored through a detailed study of the copies in certain well-recorded collections.

This painting, now in Vienna, was formerly in the Hamilton collection.

⁶⁵⁹ Interest in these paintings continues and a work ascribed to van Haecht was sold at Sotheby's New York on 28th January 2010 at twice top estimate (US\$300,000) at US\$674,500 (Lot no. 169; Sotheby's website accessed on 30/1/10). This painting may not be original, despite being inscribed G.V.H., a reminder of the need to be cautious about signatures (personal communication Ben van Beneden).

CHAPTER THREE - English Collectors of Old Master Paintings, both Originals and Copies

Introduction

As mentioned in Chapter One, collecting was a new phenomenon in England in the seventeenth century. This contrasts sharply with the situation in Italy, where it was long established. Oriental objects continued to be collected throughout the period under discussion, but ceased to be rarities as at the beginning of the century as these objects became much more widely available. Instead, a shift in focus leads to the passion for Old Master paintings, already noticed amongst the collectors of ‘Chyna’ discussed in Chapter One. Owing to scarcity of these highly desirable objects, English collectors commissioned and collected copies, which have already been noted in most collections elsewhere in Europe, as discussed in Chapter Two. There is clear evidence of the presence of copies of major sixteenth-century works in most English collections in the first half of the seventeenth century and as the taste for collecting history paintings in England grew at this time, they became widespread. As noted by Lucy Gent, by the 1590s ‘English readers were well accustomed to the idea of the virtuoso artist. For there were countless citations, given special éclat by Lyly in *Euphues*...(1579)...and *Campaspe* (1584) of skill displayed by Apelles and other classical artists in illusionist painting’.⁶⁶⁰

This chapter will examine the most important collections in the first half of the seventeenth century in England, to reveal the existence of a far greater number of copies than has previously been supposed and the ways in which these were acquired. Ham House will be presented as a case study because such copies survive there. The art market in London in the early 1650s and the sale of copies will also be investigated, together with evidence of artists active as copyists in London at that time.

In Venice, in 1622, a life of Titian by a relative, Tizianello, was dedicated to Aletheia, Countess of Arundel (*Breve COMPENDIO della Vita del Famoso Titiano Vecellio di Cadore Cavalliere, et Pittore*... (unpaginated)); while it is recognised that this will not have circulated to a wide audience in Britain, it is something which is likely to have been known to her immediate circle.⁶⁶¹ The dedication includes extravagant praise of the Countess, possibly designed to placate her after false, but damaging, accusations implicating her in

⁶⁶⁰ Gent, 2005, p.97.

⁶⁶¹ Venice, Santo Grillo & fratelli, 1622.

treason in Venice, which led to her appearance before the Doge. In this work, Daniel Nys is mentioned as a collector of works by Titian. Nys was the Flemish merchant, based in Venice and active as a picture dealer, who would later play a significant part in the acquisition of the Gonzaga collection for Charles I. Amongst other European countries, praise is given to England in particular where in the ‘Studij, & Palazzi’ there was ‘grandissime diletatione della Pittura, & Scoltura’ and a list then follows of the Prince of Wales, the Marquess of Buckingham, the Marquess of Hamilton and the [3rd] Earl of Pembroke, as well as the Earl of Arundel, in which careful note is made of their membership of the Order of the Garter, as well as their status as councillors to the king and other offices, but little is said about their actual collections. This chapter will include discussion of these collections.

Tantalizingly, Tizianello is recorded in a report by the English ambassador to Venice in March 1625 as having defaulted on an arrangement with the Countess of Arundel, whereby she:

‘paid him to go to England to paint some pictures for her. Not content with deceiving her and taking her money he has gone on to slander her saying he did not go because he feared she would take him to Spain’.

As a result, Tizianello’s arrest was ordered by the Doge and Senate, but it is not known what the consequences were.⁶⁶²

English collectors were well informed about artists. Giovanni Paolo Lomazzo’s *Trattato dell’Arte...* (Milan, 1584), which emphasised the importance of history painting and named important artists, was partly translated by Richard Haydocke as *A tracte containing the artes of curious paintinge* (Oxford, 1598), with a dedication to Thomas Bodley.

Haydocke’s introduction lamented ‘the scarcity of copies, which in likelihood were bought up by the Italian painters, for feare least the perfection of the Arte, (which they holde to reside whollie with them) might bee nowe divulged unto other Nations’. He also regretted what he perceived as a decline in the standard of painting in England ‘though it never attained to any great perfection amongst us’, which he attributed to the reluctance of buyers

⁶⁶² *Calendar of State Papers, Venice*, 18, 1912, ed. A.B. Hinds, p.607.

to spend enough money and in consequence, the unwillingness of artists to use ‘all [their] skill’. Haydocke believed this situation could be remedied if both parties would ‘give themselves to a diligent observation of the excellency of Ancient workes; indeavouring by all meanes to purchase them’. He goes on to praise ‘some of our Nobility, and divers private Gentlemen’ who ‘by their Galleries carefully furnished, with the excellent monuments of sundry famous Masters, both Italian and Germane’ were the exceptions. In praising Nicholas Hilliard (whom he compares to Raphael), Isaac Oliver and Rowland Lockey, Haydocke wished he ‘had the skilfull pen of George Vasarie’, whose *Lives* were another source of information in sixteenth-century England. This praise is of course entirely concerned with English artists who were known to practice as miniature painters (limners), which was perceived as an English speciality and naturally their names were entirely unknown to Lomazzo. Lomazzo’s text retained by Haydocke praises both Italian and Northern artists, although Lomazzo is anxious to praise local Milanese artists in particular. The highest praise is reserved for those artists who would still be considered to form the canon of sixteenth-century masters: Michelangelo, Raphael, Leonardo, Correggio and Titian. Mannerist painters such as Rosso and Parmigianino also appear and special praise is given to Lomazzo’s former master Gaudenzio Ferrari, who is less well-known today. Mantegna is almost the only artist of an older generation to be praised, with his series of the *Caesars* [Hampton Court; then still in Mantua] being singled out. Specific works are cited for many of the artists, some of which are no longer easy to identify, while in the case of Michelangelo *The Last Judgement* [Sistine Chapel] gets special mention with approval, not criticism, on more than one occasion, for instance in a description of the depiction of the angels blowing trumpets.⁶⁶³ Correggio’s *Agony in the Garden* [there is a version at Apsley House] was also greatly admired by Lomazzo; later, there was a copy in the collection of Charles I (see below p.184). Barocci and Veronese only get very brief mentions in Haydocke’s translation. Lomazzo’s second publication *Idea del tempio della pittura* (1590) has seven governors of art: Michelangelo, Gaudenzio, Polidoro da Caravaggio, Leonardo, Mantegna, Raphael and Titian.⁶⁶⁴ This group of ideal artists is generally similar to the *Trattato*, but the *Idea* was not translated into English during the period under consideration.

⁶⁶³ This perhaps suggests that he was relying on a print, as access was restricted and the angels (much criticised for their lack of wings) are not easy to see.

⁶⁶⁴ Kemp, op. cit., pp.18-19.

As was pointed out many years ago, numerous English writers depended heavily on Haydocke for their subsequent texts on art, including Henry Peacham (various publications 1606, 1612, 1622), Sir George Buc (in Stow's *Annals* 1615), Franciscus Junius (1637), Alexander Browne (1669), William Salmon (1672) and George Vertue.⁶⁶⁵ A number of these commentators wrote treatises on art, while others, such as Vertue kept extensive notes on English collections, as Evelyn and Symonds had done in the seventeenth century. Peacham's *Compleat Gentleman* (1622) contains a well-informed list of Italian artists, but he claims not to have seen Vasari. He alleged that there were only two copies of Vasari's magnum opus available in England, one of which belonged to Inigo Jones.⁶⁶⁶ In *The Gentleman's Exercise* (1634) Peacham praises Durer, Michelangelo, Holbein, Titian and Correggio, before moving on to Hiliard [sic], Isaac Oliver and Peake, a list which still bears a strong resemblance to Haydocke's text in 1598. Where he differs from Haydocke is in naming the 'patrons and favourers of this worthy skill', a list which might be questioned in its inclusion of James I and the Earl of Northampton (who are not noted collectors), but which also names Henry, Prince of Wales, the 1st Earl of Salisbury, the Earl of Arundel, the 3rd Earl of Pembroke and the Earl of Suffolk. In addition, Peacham cites the Earls of Worcester and Southampton about whose collecting activities no evidence appears to survive. It is also clear that the notes made by the 4th Earl of Bedford in his commonplace book, probably in the 1630s, depend to a very large extent on Haydocke, although these were not intended for publication.⁶⁶⁷

William Sanderson in *Graphice*, 1658, praises Charles I 'for his love to this Art'. Sanderson, who was writing after the taste for Italian paintings, especially Venetian, had been established in England by collectors emanating from the king's circle, named Raphael, Michelangelo, Veronese and Tintoretto as history painters, while Titian, Holbein and Anthonis Mor were selected for portraiture, with van Dyck receiving an honourable mention in this category.⁶⁶⁸ It is not surprising that Sanderson's list follows the well-known hierarchy of the genres in placing history painting first, followed by portraiture and then landscape, where Durer comes in for criticism, but Brill and Claude are praised. This

⁶⁶⁵ Hard, F., 'Richard Haydocke and Alexander Browne: Two Half-Forgotten Writers on the Art of Painting', *PMLA*, 55, 1940, pp.727-741.

⁶⁶⁶ Gent, 1981, p.72.

⁶⁶⁷ Wood, J., 'Van Dyck: a Catholic Artist in Protestant England, and the Notes on Painting Compiled by Francis Russell, 4th Earl of Bedford' in *Van Dyck 1599-1999: Conjectures and Refutations* ed. H. Vlieghe, Turnhout, 2001, p.182.

⁶⁶⁸ Sanderson, op. cit., pp.19-20.

is followed by still-life. Sanderson then praises Snyders for '*Hunting and Beasts of Prey*' and continues with 'in little, *Ellsamere*' and, unexpectedly, praise of Rubens in this section, an artist whose own preference was decidedly for large projects. Sanderson's remarks are hardly original and, other than artists who were not alive when Lomazzo wrote his *Trattato*, the principal omissions are Leonardo and Polidoro da Caravaggio, both of whom were praised in the Haydocke edition and were later represented in the collection of Charles I. Sanderson's list of artists working in Britain includes 'some of them...strangers born' such as Lely, but he also mentions [Robert] Walker and '*Stone and Croix* ingenious Painters in the incomparable way of *Copying* after the Antient Masters', as well as some miniature painters. The reference to Stone is probably to Symon Stone (see below p.213). Croix is one of the alternative names of Michael Cross, the copyist employed by Charles I (already mentioned). Sanderson, who is ambivalent about copies, mentioned 'the excellencies of ancient Painters: of whose Originalls many, even pretenders to this Art, are deceived with Copies'. He goes on to cite the example of '*Laniere* in *Paris*, by a cunning way of tempering his Colours with Chimney Soote, the Painting...seems ancient...he rouses [it] up and thereby it crackls, and so mistaken for an old Principall, it being well copied from a good hand'; the identity of "Laniere" in this case remains mysterious as there is no evidence for it to be Jerome Lanier, uncle of the painter Nicholas (see below p.211). Sanderson continues by saying 'An Imitator, does never come neer the first Author', thus contradicting his earlier assertion that many were deceived and makes some other disparaging remarks about copyists.⁶⁶⁹ However, Sanderson also lavishes considerable praise on Cross: 'To do this well [i.e. copying], he may be lesse excellent in the Precepts of Painting and yet in this way of working, out Master, a better *Artizan*; I knew but one, that herein (*La Croix*) who out-went all; and copied many of the Kings Originalls, from several rarities in this kind'. Despite the use of the past tense, Cross was still alive at this date, but possibly in France, of which Sanderson may have been unaware. Sanderson also acknowledges the role of copying in artistic training. His list of artistic specialisms concludes with 'excellent Masters you may meet with all these Eminencies compleat' Raphael and Titian 'the best that this Art can boast of'.⁶⁷⁰ This view would undoubtedly have been shared by the most prominent collectors in England in the first half of the seventeenth century.

⁶⁶⁹ Sanderson, p.16.

⁶⁷⁰ Sanderson, p.19.

Raphael's work would have been known through the medium of the set of the *Acts of the Apostles* tapestries owned by Henry VIII from 1542 [presumed destroyed in Berlin in 1945].⁶⁷¹ Their imagery became more widely disseminated following the acquisition of the cartoons by Charles, Prince of Wales, in 1623; as he had not seen the cartoons personally, he was presumably aware of their quality on the basis of the tapestries in the royal collection.

As king, Charles acquired Raphael's *St. George and the Dragon* [NGA, Washington] by exchange with Philip Herbert, 4th Earl of Pembroke for a book of drawings by Holbein, which Pembroke immediately gave away to the Earl of Arundel, who was a passionate collector of Holbeins. It is not known when and how this painting first came to England or entered the Pembroke collection, but it is certainly recorded in the possession of William, 3rd Earl of Pembroke (died 1630). The exchange between the king and the Lord Chamberlain was recorded by Abraham van der Doort in his catalogue of the king's collection and this small painting by Raphael joined a select group of works of similar size in the king's new Cabinet Room at Whitehall.⁶⁷² It seems possible that the 4th Earl of Pembroke was less interested in Old Master paintings than his older brother; the Raphael had been recorded in the 3rd Earl's possession in prints issued in the 1620s, for example, that in the Victoria and Albert Museum by Lucas Vorsterman dated 1627, which clearly cites him as the owner.⁶⁷³ The original work by Raphael sold for £150 on 19 Dec. 1651.⁶⁷⁴ Charles I had Peter Oliver make a miniature copy of the painting (1628, Royal Collection).⁶⁷⁵ This miniature copy is not identifiable in the *Sale*.⁶⁷⁶

A reduced scale version of Raphael's *Transfiguration* was also in the king's collection, said by van der Doort to have been a gift from Lord Lumley:

‘a little alter peece being the assention of Christ wth manie Appostles by, and one possessed youth, the Oridginall being an alter Peece in a Church at Roome done by Rafell Urbin’.⁶⁷⁶

⁶⁷¹ Campbell, T., ‘School of Raphael tapestries in the collection of Henry VIII’, *BM*, 138, 1996, pp.69-78.

⁶⁷² Van der Doort, p.79.

⁶⁷³ Nos. 34 and 35, *The Print in Stuart Britain* op. cit.

⁶⁷⁴ To Bass and others, *Sale*, p.258.

⁶⁷⁵ Van der Doort p.103.

⁶⁷⁶ Van der Doort p.69.

It hung in a favoured position in the ‘Chare roome in the privy Gallory’ with some of the king’s Poelenburghs, the Brueghel of *Three Soldiers* [Frick Collection] and the Durer self-portrait. In van der Doort (Appendix), this copy of Raphael was said to have been given by ‘my Lord of Exeter’, i.e. the 2nd Earl of Exeter, whose appreciation of painting is referred to below (p.151).⁶⁷⁷ The copy was sold on 19 Dec. 1651 for £15 [untraced].⁶⁷⁸ Raphael was alleged by some at court to be the king’s “favourite artist” (see below p.188). Buckingham also owned such a picture (see below p.162).

Titian’s paintings would first have been known in England through the presence in 1554 of a portrait [original lost, versions survive for example in the Prado] of Prince Philip, husband of Mary I and future king of Spain and a *Venus and Adonis* [Prado, several other versions survive], which were delivered to Philip while he was in London.⁶⁷⁹ The Duque de Villahermosa ‘said that when he was in England (c.1554-1555) he received a *Rape of Europa* as a gift from Titian’.⁶⁸⁰ Consequently, there was a portrait and two history paintings by Titian which could have been seen by English courtiers during Titian’s lifetime.

Other English writers who were less influenced by Haydocke also mention Italian painters and sculptors. In the case of Shakespeare, this is limited to a single reference to Giulio Romano and then only as a sculptor, which he might have picked up from Vasari’s 1550 edition which cites Giulio’s epitaph:

‘Videbat Iuppiter corpora sculpta pictaque spirare & aedes mortalium aequarier
coelo...Romanus Moriens Secum Tres Julius Artes Abstulit, Haud Mirum, Quatuor
Unus Erat’.⁶⁸¹

Ben Jonson then mentions:

⁶⁷⁷ Van der Doort (Appendix), p.225.

⁶⁷⁸ To Bass and others, *Sale* p.258.

⁶⁷⁹ Hope, C., ‘Titian, Philip II and Mary Tudor’ in *England and the Continental Renaissance: Essays in Honour of J.B. Trapp*, ed. E. Chaney and P. Mack, Woodbridge, 1990, pp.53-65.

⁶⁸⁰ Wethey, III, p.175.

⁶⁸¹ Vasari, G., *Vite de gli Architettori, Pittori et Scultori*, Florence, 1550, 2v., II, pp. 893-894.

‘six famous painters in Italy, who were excellent and emulous of the ancients – Raphael de Urbino, Michael Angelo Buonarroti, Titian, Antony of Correggio, Sebastian of Venice, Julio Romano, and Andrea del Sarto’

in *Timber*.⁶⁸² Works by most of these artists would have been found in the collection of Charles I, to part of which Jonson may have had access. In the account written of the Earl of Arundel’s embassy to Germany in 1636, the Stadthouse in Augusta was said to contain:

‘pictures painted to the life, by Apelles and Michael Angelo, of whom it is said that the one was the master, the other the man...[in another room]...round the walls are stories of the gods, painted twelve years ago by Raphael Urbino.’

Despite chronological inexactitude, this shows the importance given to the names of the great masters of the previous century and the expectation that they will immediately be recognised.⁶⁸³ Arundel himself refers in a letter of 1636 to William Petty to his desire to own ‘thinges of Leonardo, Raphaell, Corregio & such like’.⁶⁸⁴ He may well have bought the portrait of *Ferry Carondelet and his Secretary* by Sebastiano del Piombo [Thyssen, Madrid] because he believed it to be by Raphael and that it contained a self-portrait of that artist.⁶⁸⁵ It is possible that Arundel did not share the dominant taste of many of his contemporaries for Venetian paintings.

As I have discussed elsewhere, William Cecil, 3rd Baron Burghley, later 2nd Earl of Exeter (1566-1640) who travelled frequently to Italy between the 1580s and 1609 is largely ignored in modern literature or misidentified as his grandfather, the 1st Baron Burghley.⁶⁸⁶ The 3rd Baron Burghley wrote to Gilbert, 7th Earl of Shrewsbury in 1609, praising Palma Giovane, Scipione Pulzone and Giambologna, thus revealing conventional tastes by Italian standards, but real knowledge compared with most of his contemporaries. In 1630 a letter reveals that this discriminating appreciation of paintings continued: ‘leaving the finer part...as the painters do the je ne say quoy which was indeed more worth than there picture’. It was indeed that subtle distinction which makes certain paintings stand out from

⁶⁸² Jonson, B., *Timber or Discoveries: Being Observations on Men and Manners*, published 1640-1; much of this was assembled at an earlier date.

⁶⁸³ Springell, op. cit., p.77.

⁶⁸⁴ op. cit. p.264.

⁶⁸⁵ This suggestion was made by Howarth, op. cit.

⁶⁸⁶ Bracken, S. ‘The Early Cecils and Italianate Taste’ in *Evolution* op. cit., pp.201-219.

all their apparent equals which was understood by the collectors discussed below. There are a number of significant references to “ancient” works, such as the well-known letter of Walter Cope in January 1611 to Dudley Carleton, then ambassador in Venice, requesting ‘auncient Master peeces’ (cited in Chapter One, p.44). As mentioned above, Haydocke had already referred to this concept, as did Jonson in *Timber* and Sanderson in *Graphice*, so that the idea of older works of art as having an intrinsic value through their age was quite well-established. This is also alluded to in the Hamilton-Feilding correspondence discussed below (pp.168-173).

However, there was also considerable suspicion of painters and paintings, which is illustrated in the anonymous *The Tragedy of Master Arden of Faversham*, which was written in about 1590. The story, based on a true event and probably derived from Holinshed, describes numerous plots by Arden’s wife and her lover to murder her husband, several of which are unsuccessful. Three of the latter involve the painter, Clarke, who is persuaded to participate by love for his lady, rather than commercial gain, but all are equally gullible. These include not only the idea that the painter would supply poisons, but also that looking on a poisoned crucifix could kill the viewer.⁶⁸⁷ Although not specifically discussed in this play, painters had access to poisonous substances such as arsenic, which is used in making the pigment orpiment. In a similar vein, Thomas Middleton’s *Women Beware Women* (c. 1620), which is also partly based on historical fact, has Bianca [Capella] seduced in part by a visit to the ‘rooms and pictures’ which are usually kept locked. Bianca is impressed with which what she see and states that her ‘eye ne’er met with fairer ornaments’, to which Guardiano replies that: ‘livelier...neither Florence nor Venice can produce’. Following what is clearly her rape by the Duke, the procurer Guardiano informs the audience that ‘to prepare her stomach by degrees to Cupid’s feast...I showed her naked pictures’.⁶⁸⁸ Middleton is writing here before the contentious acquisition of the Gonzaga collection from Mantua by Charles I, but at a time when several other London collections certainly contained such paintings. Anne of Denmark owned ‘A naked Ladyes picture’ at Oatlands in 1617 and the collections of Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset and James, 2nd Marquess of Hamilton are also examples, the former owning a *Susanna Bathing* and *Venus, Bacchus and Ceres* (artists unknown) and the 2nd Marquess of Hamilton’s collection

⁶⁸⁷ *A Woman Killed with Kindness and Other Domestic Plays*, ed. M. Wiggins, Oxford, 2008, pp. 8-10, 18,19,45.

⁶⁸⁸ *Thomas Middleton: The Collected Works*, general editors G. Taylor and J. Lavagnino, Oxford, 2007, Act 2 Scene 2.

including ‘A Ravishment of Proserpin’ (probably by Contarini).⁶⁸⁹ William Prynne, one of Charles I’s most vociferous critics, expressed his disapproval of the possibility that the king could have been ‘seduced’ by ‘Pictures, Antiquities, Images & other vanities brought from Rome’.⁶⁹⁰ However, by the time this was published in 1645 his comments were already outdated by political upheavals. Cardinal Francesco Barberini’s correspondence reveals his anxiety that the Reni painting of *Bacchus and Ariadne*, commissioned by Henrietta Maria through his good offices, contained too much nudity. This was partly motivated by the rise of the Puritan faction during the late 1630s, but also reflects a more general concern about the possible effects of viewing such images, which would include the negative comments of both Sanderson and Middleton quoted above.⁶⁹¹ Prynne had already in 1633 expressed the view that ‘the very art of making Pictures and Images [was] the occasion of Idolatory’.⁶⁹² As Jeremy Wood has noted, the large number of van Dyck’s patrons who were Puritans, or at least Parliamentary supporters, still owned paintings of all kinds, including religious images and seem to have been unaffected by this kind of extreme thinking. Wood has also recorded the lengths to which the Parliamentary 10th Earl of Northumberland went to retain the valuable, but “superstitious”, paintings at York House in 1645, describing his behaviour as “intractable”.⁶⁹³ In the end, the Reni painting was not delivered to Henrietta Maria in London and the precise circumstances of its fate in the 1640s, prior to its destruction, remain unresolved. There is a payment of 25 scudi in the Barberini documents in September 1645 to Paolo Perugino for a copy (measuring 15 palmi (335 cm.) wide x 9 palmi (201 cm.) high) of a *Bacchus and Ariadne* by Reni.⁶⁹⁴ This could be a reference to this painting, for which these measurements would be appropriate. There is another quite different composition containing the same mythological figures by Reni, but it is much smaller and of vertical format. A painting with the figure of Ariadne and one putto was displayed in Rome in September 2002 as a fragment of the missing Reni painting [present whereabouts unknown].⁶⁹⁵ This could be an accurate identification, but it is equally likely that this is a copy derived from part of the original [Appendix IV, type J]. As mentioned in Chapter Two, there is an engraving by G.B. Bolognini which represents the whole painting.

⁶⁸⁹ GLY 319; Wilks, T., ‘The Picture Collection of Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset (c.1587-1645), Reconsidered’, *JoHoC*, 1, 1989, pp.167-177; McEvansoneya, op. cit., 1992.

⁶⁹⁰ Wood, J., 2001, p.171.

⁶⁹¹ Madocks, S., ‘Trop de beautez découvertes’ – New Light on Guido Reni’s Late ‘Bacchus and Ariadne’, *BM*, 126, 1984, pp.542-7.

⁶⁹² Wood, J., 2001, p.171.

⁶⁹³ Wood, J., 1994, p.281.

⁶⁹⁴ Lavin, op. cit., p.34.

⁶⁹⁵ *The Times* 20.9.2002.

English inventories before the middle of the seventeenth century are usually uninformative about the authorship, dimensions and even subject matter of paintings. Depending on the type of inventory, they may not even include the room location, but instead simply list all the objects of a certain type together. The inventory taken after the death of Henry VIII in 1547 names no artists, consequently the possibility of recording any copies therein is entirely excluded.⁶⁹⁶ This is no doubt partly a reflection of the lack of knowledge of those taking the inventories, especially probate inventories, which are notably different from those taken during the lifetime of the owner which are generally more informative.⁶⁹⁷ Inventories vary in their composition, so that some merely list objects by type, rather than location. Most inventories comprise room by room descriptions of the building(s) concerned; usually, a list of plate would be made separately. There are very few separate lists of paintings; where they occur it is usually because they are attached to a legal document, such as the list of paintings from the collection of the deceased Duke of Buckingham, which were to pass to his son (see below pp.159-162).

The notable exceptions to this are the van der Doort inventory of part of the collection of Charles I (see below pp.174-191) and the list drawn up by the painter Symon Stone of the Northumberland collection. In each case, a painter was employed as what we would now call the “curator” of the collection and brought specialist knowledge to the situation in a way which had not previously occurred in England, but was normal practice in other European countries. As mentioned above, prior to the *Sale* of Charles I’s collection, the only previous public sale was that of the 4th Earl of Dorset in 1645.⁶⁹⁸ The “Inventory” of this is really a sale record which includes such important information as the names of the purchasers, the estimates and the amounts realised. It includes 81 paintings, but with very little information on each, such as ‘In the Leicester Gallery: Thirty pictures..& 2 in the passag Comeing in’.⁶⁹⁹ These sold at twice estimate at £39 10s., but all the prices seem very low, perhaps a reflection of the troubled times in which this sale was held. Recently, Lena Cowen Orlin has expressed doubts about the extent to which inventories can be relied upon to produce statistical evidence, in an essay which aims to ‘suggest some of the ways

⁶⁹⁶ De Marchi and van Miegroet, 1996, p.51, note that ‘the practice of naming artists’ increased in the second half of the seventeenth century, but this refers to dealers’ practice, not inventories.

⁶⁹⁷ Bracken in Lumley 2010.

⁶⁹⁸ Transcribed in Phillips, C.J., *History of the Sackville Family*, 2v., 1929, I, pp.353-370.

⁶⁹⁹ Phillips, op. cit., p.357.

in which probate inventories are less innocent than they appear'.⁷⁰⁰ Many of the arguments presented by Orlin in that essay are accepted, but they are concerned with analysis of large numbers of probate inventories to produce statistical evidence which is not the method which has been used here, especially as very few probate inventories been traced which contain the types of object under discussion here.

The collections discussed below represent those of the most noted collectors of this period whose collections were documented and which contained copies of famous history paintings. These collectors were well-known for that activity amongst by their peers. The documentation is not always complete, as in the case of the Duke of Buckingham, but provides a useful guide to a major part of the collection. It is particularly regrettable that there appear to be no surviving documents for the collection of the Earls of Pembroke, as there are tantalising glimpses of the activities of the 3rd Earl which are not supported by inventories.

Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel

Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel, (1585-1646) was a noted collector of antiquities and, unusually amongst the courtiers of Charles I, a collector who favoured Northern painters such as Holbein and Dürer, whereas most of his contemporaries preferred Italian artists. This aspect of his taste may be a reflection of a sense of shared culture and a feeling for historical continuity. However, Arundel was by no means averse to adding copies to his collection, an area of his activity which most commentators have failed to discuss, but which will be the focus here. As mentioned in Chapter Two (p.100), William Smith, the painter who was also one of Arundel's agents, was granted an export licence from Rome in January, 1626, which included some paintings. This was cited by Howarth in 1985, but he did not mention the fact that the consignment contained a significant number of 'copie di diversi pittori moderni fiammenghi...[including] una copia di S. Gio in tela moderni'.⁷⁰¹ The fact that the paintings were "modern [i.e. seventeenth-century] copies" and "Flemish" was a factor in the permission for their exportation.

⁷⁰⁰ Cowen Orlin, L., 'Fictions of the Early Modern English Probate Inventory' in *The Culture of Capital: Property, Cities, and Knowledge in Early Modern England*, ed. H.S. Turner, 2002, pp.51-83.

⁷⁰¹ Howarth, D., *Lord Arundel and his Circle*, 1985, pp.56-57 and 231 n.5 (which gives the text of the licence); Bertolotti, A., 'Esportazione di Oggetti di Belle Arti da Roma per l'Inghilterra', *Archivio Storico Artistico, Archeologico e Letterario della Città e Provincia di Roma*, IV, Spoleto, 1880, pp.74-90, 76.

As is the case with most pre-1660 English collections, Arundel's collection was dispersed in the aftermath of the Civil War and it is difficult to fully reconstruct. Arundel travelled in both Italy and Germany and always tried to see as many works of art as possible on his journeys, but also employed agents to acquire paintings and sculpture on his behalf, as well as asking English ambassadors to act for him. This practice also followed by most other collectors, including Charles I. It is clear that Arundel also relied on his agent William Petty to assist in the education of the young artist Henrick van der Borch II in Italy, where 'I pray y^u shewe him all of art that y^u can, I hope in time he will haue a good guess of originalles from cotype', which may suggest that the painter was being trained as another agent. Despite this, Arundel wished to have 'Farnese Designes...well copyed', suggesting that like most of his contemporaries, he was willing to own a copy, provided he was not being deceived.⁷⁰² It is unclear from this whether or not Arundel referred here to the frescoes by the Carracci in Palazzo Farnese, nor whether he intended to have drawn copies or painted ones. It is quite possible that he wished to have drawn copies of Annibale Carracci's drawings which survive in large numbers for this project, particularly as he refers to the "Designes" as 'being [in the] Handes of y^e Housekeep[er]'. Arundel's letters also reveal his interest in acquiring at least part of several famous Italian collections, including that of the Duke of Bracciano, who was in severe financial difficulties.⁷⁰³ Arundel sought drawings by both Michelangelo and the lesser-known Polidoro da Caravaggio, the latter an interest later shared by Hamilton. Charles I owned nine paintings by Polidoro da Caravaggio; copies of six of these are to be found at Ham House (see below p.193), but were only acquired in the 1670s, although it has been previously suggested that they were already there in the late 1630s.⁷⁰⁴ As mentioned above, Lomazzo's pantheon of the truly admirable had included Polidoro da Caravaggio, as well as much better known painters. In a letter to Petty in 1636, Arundel sends a portrait of himself and his grandson Tom, which he wishes to have copied in relief in marble, to try out a young sculptor 'sayde to be a valente Huomo'.⁷⁰⁵

In addition to outstanding original works by Titian, such as *The Flaying of Marsyas* [Archbishop's Palace, Kromeriz], Arundel owned copies of various Old Master paintings.

⁷⁰² Springell pp. 247, 264.

⁷⁰³ Ibid.

⁷⁰⁴ Clifford, T., 'Polidoro and English Design', *The Connoisseur*, 192, 1976, pp.282-91.

⁷⁰⁵ Springell, p.262.

However, these are very seldom acknowledged as such in the incomplete inventory made in 1655, which lists over 600 paintings and drawings.⁷⁰⁶ In certain instances, the known provenance of certain paintings makes it a reasonable hypothesis that one by the same artist with the same title cited in Arundel's inventory is a copy or version of the original; these comments also apply to other contemporary inventories. This inventory was made after Arundel's death, and it cannot be considered to reflect his own knowledge of his collection. As the collection was then for sale in Amsterdam, it may be that the copies in the collection were not recognised as such or that their existence was not acknowledged in order to achieve the best possible prices. Where copies are mentioned, in two cases these are said to be by Veronese after Titian; there is also a 'Virgin and Child and St. John' which is said to be a copy after Raphael.⁷⁰⁷ Included in the collection was a version of Raphael's *Donna Velata* in which the secular sitter of the original [Pitti] had been transformed into St. Catherine [untraced]. This transformation is recorded in an engraving by Wenceslas Hollar. In only a few other cases, it is possible to determine which version of a painting Arundel owned through engravings produced by Lucas Vorsterman I and Hollar, who were both working in London.

There are also some miniature copies by Peter Oliver which can assist. An example is his signed and dated miniature [1631, formerly Charles I collection, Burghley House] of the version of Titian's *Venus and Adonis* [Vienna] owned by Arundel. In the National Gallery catalogue dealing with Venice 1540-1600, the discussion of NG 34, which is their workshop version of Titian's *Venus and Adonis* (a different composition), includes an inaccurate description of this miniature as a drawing and an attribution of it to his father Isaac.⁷⁰⁸ *Venus and Adonis* is another example of a history painting by Titian which exists in numerous versions: with three dogs or two dogs, or two dogs with their heads in differing positions, with Adonis wearing a hat or not, which have been thoroughly analysed by Wethey (volume III). Fortunately, van der Doort's entry in the king's inventory: 'done by Peter Olliver after Titian...the Picture of Adonis Venus Cupid and some doggs...whereof the Principall in oyle Cullors belongeth to my Lo: of Arrundell', together

⁷⁰⁶ The Arundel Collection, *Apollo*, 144, August 1996 (whole issue); Hervey, op. cit.; Cust, L. op. cit. Cust, L. and M.L. Cox, 'Notes on the Collections formed by Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel and Surrey, K.G.', *BM*, XIX, 1911, pp.278-286; XX, 1911, pp.323-325; XXI, 1912, pp.256-258.

⁷⁰⁷ Hervey, nos. 388 and 412.

⁷⁰⁸ Penny op. cit., p.283. The miniature is illustrated in colour on the Burghley House website.

with the survival of Oliver's miniature, permits the correct identification of Arundel's picture.⁷⁰⁹

These engravings and miniature copies are examples of the ways in which copies can provide essential information about collections which have been entirely dispersed, such as that of Arundel. Arundel's collection is the only one amongst those studied for this thesis which is represented by contemporary engraved copies of the paintings, a practice which became much more widespread later in the seventeenth century. Part of Buckingham's collection was also recorded in miniature paintings, on a cabinet (see p.164).

The collection of George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham

Buckingham, the all-powerful favourite of James I, travelled to Madrid with Charles, Prince of Wales, in 1623 and also to Paris in 1625, where he met Rubens. He formed a large collection largely through the activities of his agent, Balthasar Gerbier. The inventory produced in 1635 acknowledges the presence of some of the copies it contained, but others will be shown to have been present in what follows.

Prior to the acquisition by Charles I of the *Calling of St. Andrew* by or after Caravaggio mentioned at the beginning of Chapter Two, a painting by Caravaggio was listed amongst other works owned by James, 2nd Marquess of Hamilton in a document drawn up after his death in 1625.⁷¹⁰ He had travelled to Italy in 1610 (coincidentally, the year of Caravaggio's death) and may have acquired works there, or he may have had ambassadors act as his agents. Although the precise circumstances remain unclear, some of the 2nd Marquess of Hamilton's paintings passed to George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, and were sold in 1650. Others did not and remain untraced, including 'our lady and Christ of miche Ange de Caroviage' and 'A man coppied by Titian'; these descriptions do not reappear in the 1635 Buckingham inventory.⁷¹¹ Other ways in which Buckingham's collection was formed include not only the activities of Gerbier (see below), but also purchases from Rubens' collection, which was acquired in 1627. There were also

⁷⁰⁹ Van der Doort, p. 104.

⁷¹⁰ The authorship of the *Calling of St. Andrew* remains unresolved; van der Doort thought it a copy.

⁷¹¹ McEvansoneya, op. cit. 1992; the fullest transcription of the inventory is: Jervis, S., 'Furniture for the First Duke of Buckingham', *Furniture History*, XXXIII, 1997, pp.48-74: all references to the paintings given below are taken from this source, unless otherwise indicated.

diplomatic gifts, such as the report in early 1625 by Andrea Rossi, Venetian Secretary in England, that: 'From France they are expecting a present of pictures, selected by the Most Christian from his finest at Fontainebleau to give to the Duke of Buckingham, as nowadays all monarchs have to oblige the most powerful ministers by means of their pleasures and interests'.⁷¹² If this report was accurate, it has not been possible to determine which these pictures are from the surviving inventory of the collection, or whether, as in other diplomatic gifts, copies were included.

In the account presented to Buckingham by his agent Gerbier in 1621 for paintings he had acquired in Italy and transported back to England by various means there appears the sum of £42 'Payde at Rome for two great histories which are in maeking by a Florentin, being two peeeces lang 19 foet, being the bancket of the Gods Copyed by Raphael'.⁷¹³ Presumably, Gerbier means that a copy was being made of the Raphael ceiling fresco in the loggia of Villa Chigi [now Farnesina], rather than that he had acquired a copy by Raphael of such a painting. It is his idiosyncratic English which makes this confusing. It has not been possible to trace this in the 1635 inventory, but it is almost certain that that document is not complete, as it does not include all the residences occupied by Buckingham and his family. According to Edward Norgate, painter, herald and writer of a treatise on painting, Gerbier himself made copies of the Raphael fresco.⁷¹⁴ Evelyn in December 1644 noted that at the Farnesina 'you shall always se(e) Paynters designing, and Cop(y)ing after it, it being esteem'd one of the rarest pieces of that Art in the world, & certainly with greate reason; not to omit that other incomparable fable of Galateo[sic]...it is a most stupendious lively painting'; he paid it a second visit in 1645.⁷¹⁵

The 1635 London inventory of Buckingham's collection includes 15 clearly identified copies out of a total of 347 paintings; in some cases doubt is expressed about the artists of the 'originals' such as 'Tintoret or Titian – A Day of Judgmt'. The copies were prominently displayed throughout the collection. They are mainly after well-known painters, although in a few cases it is hard to identify the original artist. In the transcriptions of the 1635 inventory the name 'Labella Jucunda' is listed as though it were

⁷¹² *Calendar of State Papers, Venice*, XVIII, 1912, ed. A.B. Hinds.

⁷¹³ Philip, I.G., 'Balthazar Gerbier and the Duke of Buckingham's Pictures', *BM*, 99, 1957, pp.155-6.

⁷¹⁴ Betcherman, L-R., 'Balthazar Gerbier in seventeenth-century Italy', *History Today*, XI, 1961, pp. 325-331.

⁷¹⁵ *Diary*, II, pp. 288, 357.

the name of the artist.⁷¹⁶ Clearly, this is the subject of the painting (i.e. a copy of the “Mona Lisa”), rather than a previously unknown female painter; the entry continues ‘A little Picture a copy’. Betcherman is mistaken in stating that this is listed in the inventory as by Leonardo, whose name appears only once elsewhere: ‘Leonardo Venice Herodias’s Daughter wth: St: John’s head’.⁷¹⁷ The inventory also contains a copy or copies after Caravaggio: ‘Corovagio’s copy – St. Peter Crucifying Copy’, which is followed by references to ‘Aurora lying upon the clouds’ and ‘Mars and Venus’. Whether “Corovagio’s copy” should be interpreted as “copy[ist]” is entirely speculative. Alternatively, this may be an error by the unknown compiler of the inventory. McEvansoneya (2003) states that this St. Peter was a copy of the version in the Cerasi Chapel, but there is no direct evidence for this and he is generally reluctant to discuss the copies in detail.⁷¹⁸ Uniquely for an English collection at this time, a possible copy of Michelangelo is also listed: ‘Michl: Angelo, or a copy of his – A Naked Man in Chaines and Tortures’, although this could be a reference to Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio. A copy of an Andrea del Sarto *St. John the Baptist* is unusual, however, a Bassano ‘Christ in the Grave being a Copy’ is not unexpected, nor is a copy of ‘Guido – A St. Sebastian’, of which there are still many. There may be other unidentified copies amongst the unattributed works, for example, the inventory taker evidently did not realise that ‘Rubens *The Picture of Paracelsus*’ [Brussels] was one of that artist’s copies, after a painting formerly attributed to Metsys.⁷¹⁹ Also listed as an original is one of the Reni paintings Buckingham bought, a *Four Seasons* [Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna], which Spear has identified as probably by one of the assistants, Francesco Gessi.⁷²⁰

Several works by Titian appear, including ‘One great Peice of the Emperor Charles, a copy call’d Titian’s Glory being the Principall in Spaine now in the Escuriall’ [now Prado]. This altarpiece was carefully listed here using very similar terminology to that used in Spain when it was sent to the Escorial in 1574.⁷²¹ How such a description came to be repeated in this way is not clear, however, it is possible that this reflects an earlier, now lost inventory,

⁷¹⁶ Davies, R., ‘An Inventory of the Duke of Buckingham’s Pictures, etc. at York House in 1635’, *BM*, X, 1907, pp.376-382, 380; Jervis op. cit.

⁷¹⁷ Betcherman, L-R., ‘The York House Collection and its Keeper’, *Apollo*, 92, 1970, pp. 250-259.; Jervis op. cit., p.60.

⁷¹⁸ McEvansoneya, op. cit., 2003, pp.315-336.

⁷¹⁹ *Rubens: A Genius at Work*, exh. cat., Brussels, 2007, no.7.

⁷²⁰ Spear, 1997, pp.242-3.

⁷²¹ Wethey, I, cat. 149.

which has carefully been copied or that a payment to the copyist was known from which this puzzling terminology derives. Another copy of this painting was in Charles I's collection (see below p.186). The subsequent description of the Buckingham copy as 'the picture of Charles V in York House Hall' seems curious as its religious subject matter cannot have been acceptable to Puritan viewers in 1649/50.⁷²² A copy of the Titian *Gloria* in the National Gallery was proposed by Wethey as possibly Buckingham's version; it was said to have been found in Spain in 1808, which would not necessarily preclude it being the Buckingham painting.⁷²³ However, technical investigation shows that it was begun on the basis of Cornelis Cort's engraving of 1566 and then repainted, possibly with dishonest intentions.⁷²⁴ As often happens in inventories of this period, doubt is sometimes expressed about attribution: 'Titian as they say – Two pictures an Old Man and his wife'.⁷²⁵ This could be a reference to the famous image generally known as *Titian and his Mistress* discussed below (p.196).

Correspondence between Isaac Wake in Venice and his father-in-law, Edward Conway reveals that some contemporary courtiers were less comfortable in the role of artistic connoisseurs. A letter from Conway, Secretary of State to Charles I, addressed to his son-in-law, asked Wake to send: 'three or fower principall choice Pictures, original pieces, and made by the best Workmen. I will not stand upon anie price, nor anie other things but that they must bee such as may wth credit bee presented to a noble friend and there find acceptance. I can give you noe more particular direcion, but that I would bestowe £200 or £300 or more upon one or more very curious Pieces according to yor Judgement and choice'. Conway was presumably anxious to acquire 'original pieces' because he was concerned that his reputation might suffer if the paintings were presented as originals and subsequently revealed to be copies. Wake's reply reveals that he felt uncertain about his ability to carry out this commission as revealed in his letter of July 1625: 'it would be a harde taske for mee' to provide suitable pictures, not only 'because I do professe to know nothing in that way' but also 'because I knowe that there are some in England who have taken unto themselves a monoplye of passing their verdict uppon all things of this nature, so that if a man do not baptise his picture or statue at the font of their censure, he cannot be

⁷²² McEvansoneya, P., 'The Sequestration and Dispersal of the Buckingham Collection', *JoHoC*, 8, 1996, pp.133-154.

⁷²³ Wethey op. cit.

⁷²⁴ Penny op. cit., pp.304-311.

⁷²⁵ Jervis op. cit. p.59.

admitted into the church'. Nevertheless, he promised that the pictures he acquired 'shall be originals'.⁷²⁶ The intended recipient of this gift was Buckingham, who had been Conway's patron. Conway's fears were groundless, as all the pictures sent were originals.⁷²⁷ As mentioned above, collectors who used agents to make acquisitions abroad on their behalf were always at greater risk of receiving items which were not what they were reported to be (Chapter Two, pp.100-104). It was, however, very rare for the major collectors under discussion here to be able to travel.

A painting which would have been condemned as 'lascivious' in London in the 1650s was the "Venus Sleeping and Cupid Pissing a Copy after Titian" in Buckingham's collection, which might now be interpreted as a painting which took the two bottom right figures from the *Bacchanal of the Andrians* [Prado] and treated them as a separate item [Appendix IV, type J]. In his study of Titian's *Bacchanals* for Ferrara in 1956, Walker suggested that this might be a surviving painting in the Doria Pamphili collection, which may be correct.⁷²⁸ Buckingham also owned a version of the *Toilet of Venus*, which was amongst the works by Titian which was most frequently reprinted by artists outside the master's studio; Arundel appears to have also owned such a picture, which is also likely to have been a copy.⁷²⁹ There were also versions in the collections of the 3rd Marquess of Hamilton and Charles I (see below pp.168,181). The Buckingham collection contained versions of a further three paintings by Titian: *Diana and Callisto*, *Diana and Actaeon* and *Sisyphus*; these were not displayed together and are not described as copies in the inventory. It is possible that these might have been amongst the paintings Buckingham acquired from Rubens, although that acquisition predates Rubens' copying of these pictures in Madrid in 1628-9. The originals of all these were in Spain, where Buckingham would have seen them and he would thus have been aware that they were copies. He would also have been aware that Charles, Prince of Wales, had been promised the first two by Philip IV in Madrid in 1623 when the marriage negotiations appeared to be going well. A seventeenth-century copy of Titian's *Diana and Actaeon* is at Ham House and seventeenth-century copies of his *Diana and Actaeon* and his *Diana and Callisto* are at Knole; any of these could have been acquired through the dispersal of Buckingham's collection. Another painting in his collection

⁷²⁶ Shakeshaft, P., *The English Ambassadors in Venice 1604-1639*, MA report Courtauld Institute 1979, pp.27-28.

⁷²⁷ Further information emerged after submission and will be published in *JoHoC* in 2011.

⁷²⁸ Walker op. cit p. 115.

⁷²⁹ Poglayen-Neuwall, S., 'Titian's Pictures of the Toilet of Venus and their Copies', *AB*, 1934, pp.358-384, 360.

which was not described as a copy, but clearly must have been one, is ‘Raphael – The Ascension of Christ’ (i.e. *The Transfiguration*).⁷³⁰ As noted above, the king also owned a copy of this painting.

Gerbier became involved in a dispute with van Dyck in 1631 over whether or not an ‘Our Lady and St. Catherine’ by van Dyck was a copy, rather than an original.⁷³¹ Van Dyck denied authorship either in order to avoid going to England or to discredit Gerbier, who had sent what he believed to be the original to the Treasurer, Lord Weston, as a gift for either the king or Henrietta Maria. Gerbier’s letter to Weston refers to van Dyck’s ‘malice’ and desire not to go to London. This seems to be supported by a letter from the sculptor Isaac Besniers, which implicates the painter George Geldorp in the affair.⁷³² The issue here is to do with deception and the idea that a copy had deliberately been substituted for an original, rather than simply the idea of a copy. The dealer who had sold the painting to Gerbier was a painter called Salomon Nobiliers (or Noveliers), who then made a sworn deposition in front of a notary that the painting was original; one of the witnesses present was a member of Gerbier’s household.⁷³³ This is obviously a case of one man’s word against another’s, but Nobiliers cited Rubens as a witness (who was not personally present) to back up his case. The painting at issue may be van Dyck’s *The Mystic Marriage of St. Catherine* [Royal Collection], but it is not recorded in Charles I’s inventories, as noted by Horst Vey.⁷³⁴ Despite this, van Dyck was persuaded to come to London and the row seems to have blown over. Gerbier also fell out with Orazio Gentileschi, when the Florentine painter made comments about the “meritt and value” of some of the paintings in Buckingham’s collection.⁷³⁵ It is highly likely that Gentileschi’s criticisms were inspired by some of the copies in Buckingham’s collection.

When Gerbier published a treatise on painting in 1649 he recommended artists to imitate many of the painters whose works appeared in the Buckingham collection, most of which he had done so much to assemble. His list included Raphael, Titian, Tintoretto, Leonardo

⁷³⁰ Jervis, p.63.

⁷³¹ Carpenter, op. cit., pp.59-64.

⁷³² Carpenter, op. cit., p.61.

⁷³³ Carpenter, op. cit., pp.63-4.

⁷³⁴ *Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings*, S.J. Barnes et al, 2004, III.43.

⁷³⁵ Wood, J., ‘Orazio Gentileschi and Some Netherlandish Artists in London: The Patronage of the Duke of Buckingham, Charles I and Henrietta Maria’, *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art*, vol. 28, 3 (2000-2001), pp.103-128, 109 [Wood J. 2000b].

and Andrea del Sarto, as well as ‘Rubens and his disciple Anthony Van Dick’.⁷³⁶ In recommending copying as a foundation for artistic education, Gerbier was following in a very well-established tradition, as discussed above. Another publication by Gerbier was a handbook guide to Rome, which appeared in print in 1665.⁷³⁷ Strangely, he refers to ‘the rare painting in white and black of Hannibal Carasa’ at Palazzo Farnese. No such work appears to exist and this does call his judgement into question. As a creditor, Gerbier appears in the records of the *Sale* of the royal collection when he was awarded goods from the royal collection in satisfaction of monies owed to him; this also applies to Jerome and Nicholas Lanier (see below). Both of the paintings were sold on by Gerbier, not retained with a view to the possibility of returning them at some later date, were the monarchy to be restored, as happened in other cases.⁷³⁸ On 16th January 1651, Gerbier was recommended to the Trustees for the *Sale* of the collection of Charles I ‘as one whose endeavours were for the service of the Commonwealth’.⁷³⁹ It is probably not surprising, therefore, that Sanderson in *Graphice* did not miss the opportunity to criticise Gerbier as one having ‘little of Art, or merit; a common Pen-man’.⁷⁴⁰

In addition to originals and copies of Old Master paintings, Buckingham may also have owned another, highly specialised type of copy, the painted cabinet on stand [still on the market in 2010].⁷⁴¹ The cabinet said to have been owned by Buckingham is unusual in representing in the small paintings set into its framework pictures of which Buckingham himself owned the originals. These include works by Veronese formerly in the collection of the Duc d’Arschot (d. 1612) and works by Domenico Fetti, artists also represented in the collection of Charles I, following the acquisition of the Gonzaga collection. The series of small panels representing *Parables* by Fetti, copied on this cabinet, had been executed during his time in Mantua, shortly before this, and were replaced there by copies ordered by Daniel Nys.

⁷³⁶ Betcherman op. cit., 1970, p.252.

⁷³⁷ Betcherman, op.cit. 1961.

⁷³⁸ Gleissner, S., ‘Reassembling a Royal Art Collection for the Restored King of Great Britain’, *JoHoC*, 6, 1994, pp.103-115.

⁷³⁹ *Sale*, p.xv.

⁷⁴⁰ Sanderson op. cit. p.14. Gerbier’s later activities have recently been discussed in Klebusek, M., ‘Cultural and political brokerage in seventeenth-century England: the case of Balthazar Gerbier’ in *Dutch and Flemish Artists in Britain 1550-1800*, ed. J. Roding et al, Leiden, 2003, pp. 73-82.

⁷⁴¹ Riccardi-Cubitt, M., ‘The Duke of Buckingham’s *cabinet d’amateur*: an aesthetic, religious and political statement’, *BAJ*, I, 2000, pp.77-86.

The cabinet provides additional evidence for the presence of certain paintings in Buckingham's collection, even if it was made in Antwerp when the paintings were being auctioned there in 1649; many of them were then purchased by the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm. Ultimately, the only connection between Buckingham and the cabinet is the paintings which are represented upon it and while this may be a strong enough association to indicate ownership, further evidence would be required for this to be conclusive. A much finer piece of this type of furniture perhaps made as a wedding present to the Elizabeth, daughter of James I, later known as "The Winter Queen" (see ill. 11) was offered for sale at Sotheby's in May, 1988 (lot no. 165). Although no artists are discussed in the brief catalogue entry, the paintings are clearly after Rubens and van Dyck. The image on the left-hand door is a copy of van Dyck's *Amaryllis and Mirtillo* (incorrectly identified in the catalogue entry as 'Rinaldo and Armida'). The van Dyck *Amaryllis and Mirtillo* [original: Pommersfelden] painted for Prince Frederik Hendrik of Orange, unusually exists in three versions and there may have been other copies in the C17th.⁷⁴² This is one of van Dyck's history paintings most obviously inspired by Titian. It may have been painted by van Dyck using his putative painted copy [lost] of Titian's *Bacchanal of the Andrians* for inspiration; as already noted, a painting with this attribution appears in the inventory of Everhard Jabach.⁷⁴³ It is not accompanied on this painted cabinet by its pendant in the collection of the Prince of Orange, *Achilles among the Daughters of Lycomedes* [Pommersfelden]. This suggests, therefore, that the cabinet was painted using one of the copies of *Amaryllis and Mirtillo*, then remaining in Antwerp, the exclusive centre of production of this type of furniture.⁷⁴⁴ It is obvious that this cabinet cannot, in fact, have been made as a wedding gift for the Winter Queen, whose marriage took place in 1613, when van Dyck's painting did not exist; however, it could have been in her possession at a later date and her place of exile in The Hague would have meant that she would have known the van Dyck painting in the possession of its first owner.

Frans Francken II was a painter particularly associated with this genre, exclusive to the city of Antwerp, and sometimes depicts such pieces of furniture in the backgrounds of his paintings, such as *Achilles among the Daughters of Lycomedes* [Louvre], where such a cabinet features prominently in the background of the history painting (see ill. 12).

Francken's composition of this subject bears no relationship to that by van Dyck. Few of

⁷⁴² Van Dyck: *Complete Catalogue*, op. cit., III.59 and 60. The copies are in Göteborg and Turin.

⁷⁴³ Grossmann op. cit.

⁷⁴⁴ Copies of *Achilles among the Daughters of Lycomedes* are only referred to in documents of the late seventeenth century or eighteenth century and do not appear to survive.

Francken's actual cabinets survive, though there is one now in the Musée Calvet, Avignon and one at Het Loo, Appeldoorn.⁷⁴⁵ Cabinets were, of course, not only valuable pieces of furniture intended to hold the owner's most precious possessions, but also small rooms with a very similar function, of which an important survivor from the 1630s is the Green Closet at Ham House.

The Collection of James, 3rd Marquess and 1st Duke of Hamilton

The only collection for which extensive correspondence relating to its acquisition survives is that of Hamilton. This correspondence reveals for the first time anxieties about financial values, probably because Hamilton intended to dispose of some, or all, of the paintings to the king, who could not be seen openly to be making further purchases, after criticism of the acquisition of the Gonzaga collection.

As noted by Paul Shakeshaft in 1986, the 3rd Marquess of Hamilton's collection was the largest of those in England containing Italian and specifically Venetian paintings before 1650, even surpassing that of the king in 1643. It contained 600 such paintings, purchased from the della Nave and Priuli collections.⁷⁴⁶ Others had been obtained from the painter French-born Caravaggist painter Nicolas Regnier (known in Italy as Nicolo Renieri). Regnier was not only a copyist but also dealt in pictures; this means that there were likely to be more copies amongst these acquisitions than the purchasers knew. Hamilton's agent in these acquisitions was his brother-in-law, Basil, Viscount Feilding, then in Venice. Their surviving correspondence concerning these acquisitions reveals a number of concerns about the autograph status and value of the paintings being purchased in Venice, as discussed below.

Much of the Hamilton collection was later acquired by the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm and can be seen in some of Teniers' depictions of this (discussed in Chapter Two, p.140).

Shakeshaft attached little importance to the participation of the young James Arran (later 3rd Marquess and 1st Duke of Hamilton) in the 1623 visit to Madrid of the prince of Wales and

⁷⁴⁵ Härtling, U., 'Daniel, Bel et le Dragon de Babylone: Un Cabinet à Peintures par Frans Francken II (1581-1642) au Musée Calvet d'Avignon' in *Revue du Louvre*, 1991, pp.33-46.

⁷⁴⁶ Shakeshaft, 1986, p.114.

Buckingham. However, this was a seminal moment for the participants and the opportunity it offered for viewing masterpieces of Venetian painting influenced the taste of them all. Instead, Shakeshaft suggested that in addition to the collection inherited from his father the 2nd Marquess, Hamilton was steered towards Venice by Charles I. He further suggested that collecting Venetian art ‘might have been seen as a matter of factional advantage’. However, he also records the struggle between Hamilton and Arundel for possession of the Raphael *St. Margaret*, as well as the interest in Polidoro da Caravaggio, neither of whom can be described as Venetian. In addition, Shakeshaft comments on the warning to Feilding, in respect of the acquisition of drawings by Polidoro da Caravaggio, not to confuse him with ‘polidore Meress’ whom he interprets as Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio, but this seems unlikely. Caravaggio’s name was already known in London through paintings owned by the 2nd Marquess of Hamilton and the Duke of Buckingham. In addition, Charles I owned eight paintings associated with the name of Caravaggio, including two portraits, two other paintings which cannot now be identified and a copy (see below p.188). These also included an original work, *The Death of the Virgin* [Louvre], *The Calling of St. Andrew*, then said to be by a follower [Royal Collection] and ‘*Cupid lying a sleep*’.⁷⁴⁷ The latter, although stated to be by “Caravagoe”, is likely to be the variant by Caracciolo [Royal Collection].⁷⁴⁸ Michelangelo Merisi da Caravaggio is not known to have been referred to as Polidore, nor to have produced any drawings. The list of paintings which Feilding left in Venice includes ‘frutti di Carravagio’.⁷⁴⁹ It therefore seems hardly possible that Feilding could have mistaken the artist, who did indeed paint still lifes of fruit. A likely candidate to be the second ‘polidore’ is Polidoro da Lanciano, a former workshop assistant, whose stylistic closeness to Titian would make him of interest to those at the English court who were especially attracted to that artist.⁷⁵⁰

Hamilton’s letter to Feilding of 2/12 February 1637 reveals that unlike most of his contemporaries he only wanted ‘originales...and of the best masters’. Despite this, the lists of paintings sent by Feilding to Hamilton published by Ellis Waterhouse in 1952 reveal a number of uncertainties and confusion.⁷⁵¹ These include misunderstandings of the subject

⁷⁴⁷ Van der Doort, pp. 44, 88, 228; *Sale*, pp. 189, 196, 262, 272.

⁷⁴⁸ *Art of Italy*, no. 94.

⁷⁴⁹ Shakeshaft 1979, Appendix IV, unpaginated.

⁷⁵⁰ Polidoro da Lanciano biography accessed at Grove Art Online 23/06/10.

⁷⁵¹ Waterhouse, E.K., ‘Paintings from Venice for Seventeenth-Century England: Some Records of a Forgotten Transactions’, *Italian Studies*, VII, 1952, pp.1-23. The following numbers are all taken from this publication.

matter, as well as uncertainty about the authorship of numerous paintings. This suggests that whatever Hamilton wanted, he might be sent paintings which were neither original, nor by the best painters. For example, List A (which probably consists of the della Nave collection) has an entry at no. 15 'A Judeth...with the head of Olifernes of Titian it may be Herod's daughter' which indicates that the subject has not been understood. More intriguing is no. 36 'A faire Landskip found in the Studie of Titian and thought to be his work', which clearly indicates doubt about its autograph status. Uncertainty is also evident in the expression 'some say of...' used to express doubt in respect of the authorship of nos. 47, 53, 55, whilst 'A faire picture...by an uncertain hand but judged to be of Pordenone' (no. 182), does not attempt the subject matter nor certainty about the identity of the original artist. Attributions to "Bassan" may be taken as references to the very active family "firm" referred to above and most of the references to Giorgione are likely to be generic. No. 139 'A Venus looking in a glass and Cupid of Titian's brother' is most likely to be one of the many studio versions or copies of this picture (as already noted there were several in London at this time). The possibilities are numerous: there are two versions noted by Wethey, one of which has Venus with 2 cupids holding up the mirror [Wethey no. 51, original NGA, Washington] and the other has only one cupid [Wethey no. 52]. Furthermore, Rubens was a frequent copyist of this painting, [e.g. Thyssen Collection, Madrid]. There are two copies by David Teniers the Younger, probably made at the time that the Hamilton version was in the collection of Archduke Leopold Wilhelm.⁷⁵² The goddess also appears alone in a number of derivations, some of which may be traced back to Titian's studio [an example in Ca' d'Oro, Venice].

Waterhouse's List B (which tallies the paintings from Regnier's house) has at no. 9 'una Madalena di Titiano' which represents another example of a painting which was produced in large numbers and of which there is no certain "original". No doubts are expressed in Lists B or D, but three times in List C Giorgione is proposed as the alternative artist: to Titian (no. 11), to Correggio (no. 40) and to Pordenone (no. 43). This shows that "Giorgione" was a recognised name, but that there was no clear idea of his style of painting. None of those lists has any direct reference to copies. As mentioned above, Nicolas Regnier was active as a copyist, as well as a dealer.⁷⁵³ He is named as the painter

⁷⁵² There is also one formerly in the Giustiniani collection [now Berlin]. As mentioned by Wethey, a version belonged to Rudolf II and subsequently to Queen Christina of Sweden [Stockholm].

⁷⁵³ As a copyist, he appears frequently in Moir op. cit.

of only one picture in List A, no. 218, a *Venus and Adonis*, but his activities as a copyist should arouse our suspicions about a number of the attributions.⁷⁵⁴ Waterhouse was favourably impressed by the presence of the names of numerous contemporary seventeenth-century artists in List B (i.e. those paintings coming from Regnier's house), but does not appear to be aware of Regnier's alternative career as a copyist. Particular attention should therefore be paid to Waterhouse's comment that 'the mention of unrecorded works by Caravaggio and Poussin is also remarkable'.⁷⁵⁵ This is precisely the area in which Regnier was most active as a copyist and he may well have been the author of no. 22 'un quadro di ffiori e ffrutti di Michael Angelo da Caravaccio', as well as no. 26 'una parabola de ciechi del Fetti' (the original of this painting was already in Buckingham's collection in London).

Despite Hamilton's desire for 'originals', it is clear from these examples that he was not necessarily getting them. In this correspondence, the first notions of the relative values of originals and copies begin to appear and it is clear that money is the prime consideration in Hamilton's mind. No other example has been found of this being clearly stated in the same manner. The few other collectors who expressed a desire to own original works appear to be concerned about being deceived, but do not have the same possibility of onward sale in mind as Hamilton. Discussion of values became more common as the seventeenth century progressed and the development of an active auction market in London in the 1670s did much to change collectors' perceptions of precisely where value was to be found, but that period lies outside the scope of this thesis. Feilding did express doubts about some of the "Titians" on 9/19 June 1637, saying that only three of the 'stories' were acceptable 'the rest...are come from his schollars', but the portraits were 'originalls of his hand'.

Feilding's letter to Hamilton of 3rd April 1637 states that: 'The pictures are all originalls though some of them made by moderne painters', underlining the desire of most English collectors of this period for older paintings, rather than works by contemporary artists. This was an important part of the inspiration for the collecting of copies. Feilding later expressed his reservations about one aspect of the della Nave collection because 'the great quantity of Ritrattoes doth much take off from their true valew', reflecting the other important aspect of contemporary collecting, the desire for history paintings and not portraits (letter of 9/19 June 1637). Hamilton claimed in a subsequent, undated, letter to

⁷⁵⁴ There are several unattributed paintings of this subject in Hamilton's inventories.

⁷⁵⁵ Waterhouse op. cit., p.14.

have been alert to the ‘infinatt number of Tittians’, going on quite reasonably to point out that ‘you having alredie discovered some to be coppies thatt was sett doune for originalles makes the rest to be more fered, yeitt if they could be had for 1500 pounds I think they would prooffe richly worth thatt’. The words “*prove* richly worth” [my emphasis] here are an indication of his intention to try to dispose of the paintings.

A letter of 1st May 1637 reveals that Feilding had ‘agreed for a study consisting of 114 several peeces great and little of some originalls and not a few coppies’, although he implies that he is not necessarily acting for Hamilton in this instance, but perhaps hoping to persuade him to buy them. This tempting offer seems to have had the desired effect as Hamilton replied that if they ‘be not all Coppies they are worth much more than the munnie therefore I shall intreatt you to goe on...and heast [them] home’, although ultimately this particular transaction may not have taken place. It is unlikely that these are the paintings referred to by Hamilton in his letter of 22nd July (see below), as this seems to be too short a period for this cargo to have reached him. However, this supposition may not be correct.

Concerns about value in this correspondence is probably related to the likelihood that the king was the intended ultimate purchaser of the best pieces and was putting up the money, as Hamilton said ‘if I heave a mynd to turne marchand’ (letter of 7/17 July, 1637). Political circumstances in England ultimately rendered this impossible.

Provisos were placed upon the transaction, not least that as Charles I had ‘found by experiens to heave bein practised...that the originalls be not retened and coppies given in ther place’. It is not known in what context the king had experience of this particular practice, although this was a rumour which circulated about Nys, but perhaps the warning ultimately came from van der Doort or Inigo Jones. Noticeably similar language was employed in an almost contemporary letter to Italy dated 16th February 1636 about paintings for the king, where anxiety is expressed regarding a painting of the Madonna which might be by Raphael ‘o della scuola sua’.⁷⁵⁶ In the case of the latter, its value would have been lower than the price quoted. In November, a further letter underlined the growing expertise at the English court and the need for full details of the paintings offered for sale including sketches of them, their measurements, painters and prices, as urged by

⁷⁵⁶ Lightbown, R.W., ‘Van Dyck and the Purchase of Paintings for the English Court’, *BM*, 111, 1969, pp.418-421.

van Dyck. The last surviving document in this correspondence, dated 27th January 1637, closely echoes Hamilton's language quoted above in saying that care must be taken 'che non spaccia copie per originali, come alcuni hanno fatto', this suggestion apparently coming from Lord Arundel's eldest son, Maltravers.⁷⁵⁷ Perhaps the Arundel family was the ultimate source of this anxiety, having heard about it from their agents; in this instance, it was proposed to send William Petty to look at the paintings, but in the end this project seems to have fizzled out. The concerns expressed in both cases are a reflection of anxiety about being cheated by the dishonest substitution of a copy for an original, rather than the straightforward commissioning of or acquisition of a known copy of an unobtainable masterpiece. The substitution of copies for originals was a criticism also made of the painter Peter Lely in 1680, although this was said in a private letter to Sir Thomas Isham.⁷⁵⁸

On 22nd July 1637 Hamilton expressed the view that the paintings were worth what they cost, despite the fact that some of them were "ordinarie" and 'sume coppies lykwys as thoes of guido and the night peeis of Bassan'; in both cases, he refers to workshops where there was never a guarantee of an original work, so whether he is identifying copies from another workshop or merely recognising the inevitable is difficult to determine. The 1638 inventory of Hamilton's collection refers to 'a copy of Basson' *Annunciation to the Shepherds*, without identifying the copyist, which is likely to be the same painting.⁷⁵⁹ The reference to "guido" shows that knowledge of Reni's studio practice was not confined to Italians. Feilding wrote to Hamilton that whereas 'the Helenas head is of his schoole, but thought to be touched by him', Feilding had been assured that the 'St. Peeters head...is an originall, and am promis'd a certificate thereof from Guido Rheno and that it is of his most fierce and best way'.⁷⁶⁰ "Fierce" is not necessarily the adjective which most readily springs to mind in connection with Reni, nor applicable to this image of St. Peter in repentance [Kunsthistorisches Museum] and no doubt represents Feilding's attempt at a verbal description of the complexities of autograph painting.

Writing again on 4/14th August, Hamilton says he has:

⁷⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁵⁸ *Painted Ladies: Women at the Court of Charles II*, exh. cat., NPG, 2001, p.52.

⁷⁵⁹ Garas, K., 'Die Entstehung der Galerie des Erzherzogs Leopold Wilhelm', *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlung in Wien*, 63, 1967, pp. 39-80 ("1976b"). This painting also appears in the 1643 inventory.

⁷⁶⁰ Shakeshaft, 1986, p.126.

‘again lounded on thoes pictures which ye last sent me I assure you I am weill satisfied with them for thoe they be bot of indiferent masters and some few coppies there ar lykwys among them yeitt they are weill worth whatt was geiven and if I woold turne marchand I could gain by the saill of them’.⁷⁶¹

This also suggests that Hamilton was just as interested in paying the right price and being able to profit from the transaction as he was in the actual paintings and as these were the paintings acquired from Regnier, there were indeed likely to be a number of copies among them. Feilding’s letter of 15/25th September refers to paying ‘the painter for copying them’ which, as it occurs in a letter referring to the Priuli *St. Margaret*, then attributed to Raphael, demonstrates that the paintings bought from this collection were to be replaced with copies. Feilding refers to this again in his letter of 5th December 1637 which mentions returning ‘theire copies with new frames’. The copyist is not named, but this might be the connection which gave rise to the story about Michael Cross substituting his work for Raphael’s (discussed in Chapter Two, p.80). Shakeshaft’s Appendix II (1979, unpaginated) contains a list of paintings sent from Venice by Feilding to Hamilton, with handwritten annotations by the latter. These include ‘A Madonna of Titian’ with the note ‘I make a great question whether this piece be all Titian’s howsoever it is a very rare one’. It may be inferred therefore that Hamilton was prepared to accept this painting and valued it because it was different from any he had seen in other London collections. Hamilton owned a variant [Appendix IV, type D] of the Titian *Rest on the Flight into Egypt* which belonged to Charles I (see p.190). This can be seen in the version of Teniers’ painting of the gallery of the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm that is in Madrid, for example, and this demonstrates the way in which the Teniers paintings can be useful in helping to identify variants of paintings which were in London in the late 1630s.

The inventories of Hamilton’s collection taken in 1638 and 1643 contain a large number of unattributed paintings, as well as instances in which doubt is expressed about the authorship of certain works.⁷⁶² An example of this in 1638, no. 24, *A bare arme goeing to kyll a young^e man, one more excell^t piece of Tyssian or jorione* which would now be identified as *The Bravo*, by Titian [Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna].⁷⁶³ Only ten copies are listed in

⁷⁶¹ All quotations of letters are taken from Shakeshaft 1986 pp.123-132.

⁷⁶² Garas, 1967b, op. cit.

⁷⁶³ In 1643 it is listed as a copy: Garas 1967b, p.74.

1638 out of 384 paintings, of which nine were clearly copies made in England; five are copies of portraits by van Dyck (of which one is said to be by “Rameye”, that is the copyist Remigius van Leemput). Among the other copies, are two which ‘came from whytehall of Rubins copping’. These are described as ‘one of vinus and cupid and Mercury’ and ‘The other of venus a slepe, and the satyr...wth 4 other figures, 2 doggs’ and thus they appear to be copies of the Correggio *Education of Cupid* and Titian’s *Venus del Pardo*, but the original artist(s) are not identified. In 1643 they appear again without Ruben’s name, but with those of the original artists. There are also two miniature copies, one after Titian’s so-called ‘*Allegory of the Marques del Vasto*’ and one after Correggio’s *Jupiter and Antiope*, by “Legrainge”.⁷⁶⁴ These must have been made in England, as the originals of these paintings were in the collection of Charles I. The painter of these miniature copies was probably the miniaturist David Des Granges, by whom a signed and dated (1640) copy of the Titian survives at Ham House (see below, p.197). In 1643 twenty copies are included in the inventory, of which six are after Titian (including two certainly made in England). None of these copies can be traced in the lists published by Waterhouse.

In 1649, when the collection was for sale, only one copy is identified in the list (of a Giorgione), but a number of paintings which are probably copies appear as originals, such as the Fetti *Parable of the Blind Leading the Blind*, which as was suggested above, may be a copy painted by Nicolas Regnier, although it is listed as an original.⁷⁶⁵ This decline in the number of stated copies in the collection must be a reflection of the intention to sell it.

The collection of Charles I

In discussions of collecting in early seventeenth-century England, the activities of Charles I and his agents have received the greatest attention and his collection is undoubtedly the most famous of that period. This is partly because of his acquisition of the Gonzaga collection from Mantua, which instantly transformed his collection into one of the best in contemporary Europe. The other factor which has ensured enduring interest in the king’s collection is the manner of its dispersal, following his execution in January, 1649. Despite this, little attention has been paid to the copies of Old Master paintings which the king also collected and commissioned, which will be discussed here.

⁷⁶⁴ Garas, 1967b, pp.67,68.

⁷⁶⁵ Garas, 1967b, p.70.

The most important contemporary sources of information for the king's collection are the inventory compiled by van der Doort, mainly in 1639, and the documents relating the *Sale* of the king's collection which have already been mentioned. However, the compilers of the *Sale* documents varied considerably in their level of knowledge, resulting in some curious descriptions of the paintings concerned. In contrast, van der Doort's inventory is the first in England to rise to the sort of standards which have been illustrated in Chapter Two in seventeenth-century Italian inventories, such as the Aldobrandini, Borghese or Farnese. Van der Doort gives frame descriptions, picture measurements, medium, supports and even the fall of light within the picture and quite frequently indicates the recent provenance of the painting, which at that date was unique in England. No doubt this level of detail was prompted by the fact that he was himself a practising artist. It is to be regretted that his inventory does not cover all the king's residences and their contents. Jeremy Wood has noted that a warrant had already been issued in 1628 for an inventory to be made, but this document does not survive and whether or not it was available to van der Doort must remain speculative.⁷⁶⁶ In the publication of van der Doort's inventory in 1958-60, Oliver Millar included as an Appendix a further inventory, possibly written by Sir James Palmer.⁷⁶⁷ This very often repeats what van der Doort had already said, but excludes such important information as measurements etc. In one or two instances it does provide information additional to that provided by van der Doort and these will be cited. This will be referred to here as van der Doort (Appendix) to distinguish it.

Wherever possible, van der Doort's inventory has been compared with the *Sale* records in what follows. Sometimes, van der Doort's original labels on the backs of the paintings (referred to above) survive, at least in part, and in some cases the HP, CP and CR brands also survive or have been transferred from other supports. These stand for Henricus Princeps, Charles's deceased older brother, Carolus Princeps and Carolus Rex for Charles himself; an example of this is the Palma Giovane *Prometheus* [Royal Collection] given by Robert Cecil in 1608, which has the HP brand. Regrettably, the descriptions of paintings in the inventories of the collection of Anne of Denmark (references from which were cited in Chapter One) are not sufficiently detailed to permit certain identifications with works subsequently to be found in Charles I's collection, particularly because they do not include

⁷⁶⁶ Wood, J., 2000a, p.119.

⁷⁶⁷ This appears between pages 201 and 228.

any artists' names. In 1611 the Venetian ambassador referred to Prince Henry's 'most beautiful gallery of very fine pictures, ancient and modern, the large part brought out of Venice'.⁷⁶⁸ Unfortunately, there is no surviving inventory to enable certain identification of all these works, but eventually they must have been inherited by Charles I.

Despite the doubts ascribed to him by Hamilton and van Dyck, already mentioned, Charles I owned and commissioned a large number of copies of history paintings. According to van der Doort, whose incomplete inventory appears to have been closely scrutinised by the king, Charles owned 21 copies of history paintings, out of a total of 206, which represents approximately 10%.⁷⁶⁹ According to the *Sale* records, there were 47 such copies present, which represents .074% of the total of 638 history paintings recorded in the *Sale* documents. The total number of all paintings in the *Sale* documents was recorded by Oliver Millar as: "about 1,570".⁷⁷⁰ However, the *Sale* documents are frequently inaccurate and clearly there were more copies present which are not identified as such. Prices achieved in the *Sale* for copies versus original works have not previously been studied, but will be discussed below. Indeed, little attention has been paid to prices for pictures in England during this period and, regrettably, François Portier's article on this subject proves to be very unreliable.⁷⁷¹

The visit Charles had made to Madrid in 1623 while still Prince of Wales influenced him in a number of ways, not the least of which was the number of copies of famous masterpieces to be seen in major Spanish collections. During this visit, Charles acquired his first copy, paying Gines Carbonel 330 reales for a 'copie of Titian of our Saviour bearing the Crosse'. In the *Sale* documents a picture of this subject, which was not identified as a copy, was sold to [Captain John] Stone's dividend on 23 Oct. 1651 for £6.⁷⁷² It is possible that this is the same picture.

⁷⁶⁸ Quoted in Wilks, 2005, p.152.

⁷⁶⁹ There are a number of repetitions in van der Doort, which may mean that this total number is slightly inaccurate. These calculations have not previously been made.

⁷⁷⁰ Millar, O., *The Queen's Pictures*, 1977 p.56. Works surviving in the Royal Collection, both original and copies, have been discussed by John Shearman *The Early Italian Paintings in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (Cambridge, 1983) and Michael Levey *The Later Italian Paintings in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen* (2nd edition, Cambridge, 1994), as well as *The Art of Italy* op. cit.

⁷⁷¹ Portier, F., 'Prices Paid for Italian Pictures in the Stuart Age', *JoHoC*, 8, 1996, pp.53-69.

⁷⁷² *Sale*, p.302.

In his life of Rubens, Bellori claimed that the artist was called to Spain in 1623 at the time of Charles's visit to paint copies of 'the most beautiful original works of Titian', which then remained in Spain 'because that marriage did not take place'.⁷⁷³ This statement, repeated by Loh, can be demonstrated to be factually inaccurate as Rubens did not visit Madrid in 1623 but made his copies of Titian's *poesie* during his visit in 1628 and they did not remain there, but were acquired on behalf of Philip IV at Rubens' posthumous sale. Some of the copies in the *Sale* documents are described as being by Rubens: 'Diana and Acteon: coppie After Tytsian by S^r Peter. Rubens'.⁷⁷⁴ There was also a version of Titian's *Diana and Callisto* attributed to Rubens; both were at Hampton Court and both were purchased by the painter Jan Baptist Gaspars at £31 each.⁷⁷⁵ He was quite active at the *Sale* buying a total of 55 paintings. If these attributions to Rubens are correct, they indicate either that he copied these paintings twice whilst in Madrid, or that Charles I made unrecorded acquisitions at Rubens' posthumous sale. Neither of these explanations seems at all likely and the attributions were most probably made in error. These are the only copies by Rubens of works by Titian in the *Sale* described as such, although a copy by him of Titian's portrait of *Isabella d'Este in Red* was also in Charles I's collection. Such a painting is recorded in the *Sale* documents: 'The Dutchess of Mantua at £2, by Rubens, sold 23 Oct 1651'.⁷⁷⁶ This is not specified as a copy after Titian, but seems an astonishingly low price for a work by Rubens (or an original work by Titian).⁷⁷⁷ We know that Rubens made two copies after Titian of portraits of Isabella d'Este (in the other, she wore black) because they are recorded in Rubens' death inventory in 1640.⁷⁷⁸ The painting sold on 23 Oct 1651 cannot be that recorded in Rubens' collection, because, although Charles I was interested in making acquisitions at the sale held after Rubens' death, political turmoil in England made this impossible.⁷⁷⁹ Charles I marked the 29 paintings he wished to acquire in the only surviving manuscript copy of the Rubens inventory and neither of these two portrait copies is marked in this way.⁷⁸⁰ Consequently, as the surviving copy [Vienna] is identifiable from Rubens' posthumous sale, this reveals that in fact Rubens made two copies of the Titian portrait of *Isabella d'Este in Red* and this has not previously been noticed.

⁷⁷³ Bellori, p.198.

⁷⁷⁴ *Sale*, p.187.

⁷⁷⁵ *Sale*, p.201.

⁷⁷⁶ To G. Greene & others *Sale*, p.265.

⁷⁷⁷ Examples of prices of works attributed to Rubens in the *Sale* are £150 or £60 (pp.137 and 151).

⁷⁷⁸ *Gonzaga: La Celeste Galeria* op. cit., no.13.

⁷⁷⁹ The version of "Isabella in Red" in Rubens' collection was purchased by the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm; the copy of "Isabella in Black" is lost.

⁷⁸⁰ *Rubens: A House of Art*, op. cit., pp. 87, 329.

As noted by Oliver Millar, the original portrait by Titian (lost) may be that recorded in the collection of Charles I by van der Doort in a characteristic entry:

	<i>pijntit opan de raeht lijeht opan</i>	[above line]
<i>sijd tu bi</i>	Item the Picture ^ of the Marquess of Mantua <i>his ladi</i>	
done by	in an old fasshioned reed velvet apperell	
Tichian	<i>bing</i>	[above line]
	with her right hand ^ done to the knees	3fo – 2f5.
	halfe figures Soe bigg as the life	
	In a wodden guilded frame. <i>opan</i>	
	<i>klaeht</i> ⁷⁸¹	

‘A dutchess of Mantua By Titian’ was sold on 3 Sept. 1650 for £50.⁷⁸² As we might expect, there is a considerable difference in price between the painting attributed to Titian and the copy. This is, however, a differential which will only gradually take hold in England during the course of the seventeenth century. As mentioned in Chapter Two (p.57), De Marchi and van Miegroet noted a much smaller differential in their research and this is a rare example in the *Sale*. As discussed below (p.191), the *Sale* and the prices revealed therein operated very differently from a conventional auction. De Marchi and van Miegroet posited that this differential was ‘a payment for invention, meaning...creative origination’. While this proposal has many merits, it should be borne in mind that their research was concerned with copies made and sold in the same period, rather than Old Master paintings.

A copy by an unnamed artist of a Crucifixion by Rubens was sold (in a section dealing with Somerset House and Whitehall) for £4, although it is not clear whether this sale was to Harrington or the painter, Emmanuel de Critz.⁷⁸³

Carducho stated that during the 1623 visit to Madrid Charles acquired a painting, on copper, by Correggio, without identifying the subject, from the remains of the *almoneda*

⁷⁸¹ *Van der Doort*, p.39.

⁷⁸² To Geere, *Sale*, p. 268.

⁷⁸³ *Sale*, p.309. Harrington’s first name is not recorded, but he appears to have been a draper. .

(estate sale) which took place between 1609 and 1610 after the death of Pompeo Leoni.⁷⁸⁴

It has not previously been noticed that this could be the painting identified by van der Doort:

Item a Mary Maudlin lying downe along upon –
 the ground in a darke yellow drapery a lanskip
 by painted upon Copper being intire little figures [sic] 1f4½ - 1f 4
 in a wooden frame. painted upon the right light⁷⁸⁵

In a footnote, Millar observed that in another document this was said to be: ‘*done by on auffte koracis*’ which led him to propose that this was a version of a Carracci picture. No such composition in any medium is recorded in Posner’s catalogue of Annibale Carracci’s work. This picture was one of those selected for display in the king’s new Cabinet Room at Whitehall, which were brought over from the Cabinet Room at St. James ‘By yo^r Ma^{ty} especiall commaund’.⁷⁸⁶ That room contained 73 mainly small paintings, including the Titian *Lucretia* [Royal Collection] and the Mantegna *Death of the Virgin* [Prado] and several works attributed to Raphael; these were the most choice pictures, so the Mary Magdalene was in good company. In van der Doort (Appendix) this is described as:

A little Entire peece of Marie
 Magdalen lyeing att length leaneing
 her right hand upon a Booke done
 upon Copp By Corattz⁷⁸⁷

Such a picture by Correggio formerly existed in Dresden and is known to have been copied by Cristofani Allori and others, although its original owner has not been identified.⁷⁸⁸ If the suggestion that this work was by Correggio, not one of the Carracci, is correct, the painting recorded in the collection of Charles I would be one of the variants of the original work in Dresden. The fact that in surviving versions she has her proper left hand on the book may simply reflect the fact that in van der Doort (Appendix) the reference is to the viewer’s

⁷⁸⁴ Helmstutler Di Dio, K., ‘The chief and perhaps only antiquarian in Spain: Pompeo Leoni and his collection in Madrid, *JoHoC*, 18, 2006, pp.137-167 and online appendices, p. 157.

⁷⁸⁵ Van der Doort p.80.

⁷⁸⁶ Van der Doort, p.76.

⁷⁸⁷ Van der Doort (Appendix) p.208.

⁷⁸⁸ Gould, C., *The Paintings of Correggio*, 1976, pp.279-280.

right and left instead. At the *Sale* 'Mary. Magdalene readeing on y^e ground' was sold to Leemput on 26 March 1650 for £15.⁷⁸⁹ Although unknown to Gould, there is a good surviving version on copper of the Correggio painting in the Galleria Borghese, first recorded there in 1650, which is almost identical in size to that formerly in Dresden. Gould was also not aware that in 1655 there was a version in the inventory of Prince Maffeo Barberini and in addition, there was a copy by Jean Lhomme in the 1638 inventory of the Marechal de Créquy (referred to above).⁷⁹⁰ One of Daniel Nys's lists of the Gonzaga collection contains a reference to 'Una Maddelena in terra, copia del Correggio del Fetti'.⁷⁹¹ It is very unusual for van der Doort not make a special note of any painting that came from Mantua, but he does not mention that source in this case. As suggested above, it was not uncommon for the names Correggio and Carracci to be confused, but also Annibale Carracci's undoubted debt to Correggio may have led to stylistic confusion, while van der Doort's spelling (and by implication pronunciation) may have caused further complications.

Before Charles I purchased the Gonzaga collection, the export licence granted to Nicholas Lanier in Rome on 26th January 1626 refers to two heads of putti 'copie moderne di Titiano' in a list of at least 53 paintings (some of the entries are difficult to interpret precisely in terms of numbers).⁷⁹² These cannot be traced in the *Sale*.

Although not identified as a copy, even though it must have been known by all concerned that it was, a dealer called Geraerd in Madrid offered Endymion Porter, the courtier with the strongest Spanish connections of all, a "ritratto del emparatris di tichiano" in Madrid 24 April 1631. This is then recorded by van der Doort as 'Done by Tichian = Bought by the Kinge of Nathaniell garrett' and is usually said to be the painting now at Charlecote House [National Trust].⁷⁹³

Sandart, who visited London in 1628, refers to what was possibly a copy of the Bellini/Titian *Feast of the Gods*, from the series of *Bacchanals* originally made for Ferrara,

⁷⁸⁹ *Sale* pp.304, 310.

⁷⁹⁰ *Correggio e l'Antico*, exh. cat. Galleria Borghese, Rome, 2008, p.59, ill. p.60.

⁷⁹¹ Luzio, A., *La Galleria dei Gonzaga venduta all'Inghilterra nel 1627-28*, Milan 1913, p.153.

⁷⁹² Bertolotti op. cit., pp.77-78.

⁷⁹³ Shakeshaft 1979 p.14, n.12; Van der Doort p. 24.

at Whitehall Palace, but does not identify it as a copy and names Titian as the artist [untraced].⁷⁹⁴

Van der Doort's inventory contains a large number of copies, mostly anonymous, mainly after sixteenth-century artists such as Correggio and Titian. It records 'A Naked Venus with a Cupid after Titian By Coiniett' in a section of paintings in the Gallery at St. James's Palace.⁷⁹⁵ As this entry occurs only in van der Doort (Appendix), there are no measurements to permit a comparison between Titian's original and the copy. Gielis Cogniet (1542-1599, also known by variant spellings) was noted as a copyist and there was a *Cupid holding a mirror to Venus* after Titian signed and dated 1579 [formerly in Kassel; whereabouts unknown since 1942].⁷⁹⁶ This was briefly alluded to by John Shearman without further exploration; both Shearman and Wethey inaccurately describe this picture as still in existence (see ill. 13).⁷⁹⁷ Puzzlingly, the *Sale* documents mention 'A naked Venus. lying along soe big as ye life wh Cupid at her head; done by Congiet'.⁷⁹⁸ This is obviously a completely different format and not one which would have prompted the appellation "after Titian" as easily as the upright format of the ex-Kassel painting. The reference does, however, appear in the section relating to the Privy Apartments at Whitehall, with many of the other paintings stated to be by Titian (all of which are still accepted to be originals). The *Sale* documents refer to 'Cupid lookeing in a lookeing glass; by Tytsyan' sold to Gaspar on 31st October 1649 for £42.⁷⁹⁹ Whether this is an error for the familiar *Venus and Cupid with a Looking Glass* is impossible to determine. Whereas the van der Doort (Appendix) description tallies with the widely copied painting by Titian referred to above, with either one or two Cupids, the *Sale* reference to a reclining Venus sounds more like a version of *Venus and the Organist*, although the version owned by Charles I did not contain Cupid, who is replaced in this instance by a dog, or the 'Venus in a Lanskip. By Titian' which appears in van der Doort (Appendix).⁸⁰⁰ The picture of the 'lying' Venus was sold to Colonel [William] Webb on 25th October 1649 for £25, together with one of the two original compositions of the painting by Titian representing the 'Burial

⁷⁹⁴ Walker, op. cit., p.113.

⁷⁹⁵ Van der Doort (Appendix) p.228. Charles I owned two other works by Cogniet, Ibid. p.188.

⁷⁹⁶ Van Mander, trans. Miedema op. cit., V, pp.1-9; information from Kassel Museum.

⁷⁹⁷ Shearman 1983 p.268.

⁷⁹⁸ *Sale* p.71.

⁷⁹⁹ *Sale* p.306.

⁸⁰⁰ Van der Doort, (Appendix) p.228.

of Christ' for £120 (see below p.210).⁸⁰¹ If the painting sold to Webb together with the "Burial" did in fact resemble a composition by Titian, the two pictures Webb purchased may have been stylistically and compositionally related. Webb, who is not in ODNB, was Surveyor General 1649-1660.⁸⁰² Presumably, he was thus in a good position to know what was going on and could act quickly; he was certainly a major purchaser at the *Sale* of the collection of Charles I and will be referred to frequently below. Webb, like Colonel Hutchinson, who was also a major purchaser, was not a creditor of the king. Although many of Webb's purchases were bought from him by Cárdenas, it is not necessarily the case that he was only active on behalf of the Spanish ambassador as implied by Brotton and McGrath.⁸⁰³

Another Northern artist whose copies feature in Charles I's collection was Cornelis van Poelenburgh, who was in England 1637-41 and whose copies of 'y^e Nativytie of Christ' and 'The 3 Kinge' were sold to Leemput on 17 May 1650 for £4 10s. each; in neither case is the original artist identified in the *Sale* documents and these cannot be traced in van der Doort.⁸⁰⁴

Charles clearly liked the small paintings executed on copper by Johann (or Hans) Rottenhammer and the two he owned were placed in the exclusive Cabinet Room at Whitehall: one of these was *Venus, Cupid and Two Satyrs* 'w^{ch} your Ma^{tie} had of M^r Willm Murrey one of your Ma^{ts} Bechamb[er]', i.e. the Murray of Ham House.⁸⁰⁵ (See below for case study of the Ham House Collection). Van der Doort may mean that Murray gave the king this picture, or as seems more likely, that the king bought it or acquired it, as he often did, by exchange. The other: 'Jupiters golden raine whereby Dane laying upon her bedd with a redd curtaine and Cupid being by, and the old woman receaving the golden raine' was given 'by my Lord Anckorum', which was a variant of this subject by Titian. This was sold to C. Lanier on 21 June 1650 for £20.⁸⁰⁶ There is a copy of the Rottenhammer *Danae* at Ham House (see below). In 1656 the 10th Earl of Northumberland purchased a *Venus* by

⁸⁰¹ *Sale* pp.70, 71.

⁸⁰² Madge, S.J., 'Colonel William Webb, Surveyor-General 1649-1660', *Notes and Queries*, 181, 1941, pp. 114-116.

⁸⁰³ Brotton, J. and D. McGrath, 'The Spanish acquisition of King Charles I's art collection: the letters of Alonso de Cárdenas, 1649-51', *JoHoC*, 20, 2008, pp.1-16.

⁸⁰⁴ *Sale*, p. 191.

⁸⁰⁵ Van der Doort p. 77.

⁸⁰⁶ Van der Doort pp.77, 85; (Appendix) 210; *Sale*, p. 258.

Rottenhammer from ‘Mr. Webb’.⁸⁰⁷ Although this reference has been interpreted by Jeremy Wood as being to the architect John Webb, it is much more likely to be to Colonel Webb, who was a notable figure in the secondary market in the 1650s. Rottenhammer, like Cogniet before him and Poelenburch later, spent some years in Italy and was strongly influenced by Venetian artists, consequently his style of painting was certain to appeal. In addition, the king purchased one of the paintings Rottenhammer did jointly with Jan Brueghel, also on copper, *The Resurrection of Lazarus* from Endymion Porter, one of those who had accompanied him to Madrid in 1623.⁸⁰⁸ Van der Doort does not record a purchase price.⁸⁰⁹ Robert Ker, 1st earl of Ancram, who had also gone on the abortive visit to Madrid in 1623, gave the king a further six paintings: a portrait of Giambologna [possibly Shearman no. 25], a copy of a Raphael Madonna and Child [untraced],⁸¹⁰ a version of an Anthonis Mor portrait [Royal Collection], and three paintings by Rembrandt: a young scholar reading a book [untraced] and a Self Portrait [possibly in the Walker Art Gallery, Liverpool] and the so-called “Rembrandt’s Mother” [Royal Collection].⁸¹¹ William Murray is only recorded on one occasion by van der Doort as giving a work of art to the king, which was a bronze head of Moses.⁸¹² In neither the case of Murray nor Ancram does van der Doort record gifts from the king to them, although he does so in other instances.

In numerous cases, doubt is clearly expressed about the authorship or autograph status of certain paintings in the king’s collection, such as two versions of *The Mystic Marriage of St. Catherine* each of which was ‘A mantua peece’ i.e. acquired with the Gonzaga collection and in each case ascribed by van der Doort to ‘some out of Rafael d’Urbino schoole’.⁸¹³ An anonymous copy of Correggio’s *Mystic Marriage* was sold to Colonel Webb on 27th October 1649 for £25.⁸¹⁴ However, the latter is most likely to be a version of the composition which includes St. Sebastian, then at Palazzo Barberini [see Chapter Two, p.121], recorded at Whitehall by van der Doort as ‘Saide to Be done by Corrigio = & by Some esteemed to be a verie good old coppie’, given to the king by Buckingham.⁸¹⁵ An

⁸⁰⁷ Wood, J., 1994, p. 302.

⁸⁰⁸ Van der Doort p. 86; *Sale* p.258

⁸⁰⁹ It was sold to Bass & others on 19 Dec. 1651 for £30 [untraced].

⁸¹⁰ This might be ‘Mary Christ; after Raphaell’ listed at £3 in *Sale* (p.303) – no buyer is recorded.

⁸¹¹ Van der Doort pp. 55,56,57,60.

⁸¹² Van der Doort p.96.

⁸¹³ Van der Doort, p. 83.

⁸¹⁴ *Sale* p.71.

⁸¹⁵ Van der Doort, p.26.

Agony in the Garden ‘said to bee of Thadeo Zucaro or ells a Coppy of Coregio’, reappears in (Appendix) with an attribution to “Frederick Sucary”.⁸¹⁶ In the *Sale* documents, ‘Christ in ye Garden by Correggio’ was ‘sold to Leemput on 22 March 1649/50 (?) £34’.⁸¹⁷

Padovanino is named in van der Doort as the copyist of ‘Cupid. playing with two pigions Being a Coppie after Techin’ and this was sold (without the copyist’s name) to [David] Murray (the king’s tailor) and others on 23 Oct. 1651 for £4.⁸¹⁸ Despite Padovanino’s reputation as a copyist of Titian, his name only appears once in the *Sale* documents: ‘A Madona. in a red gowne, by padowynyn after Tytsyan’ which was sold for £5 to Jackson and others on 23 Oct. 1651 (from Somerset House or Whitehall).⁸¹⁹ The painting of Cupid has often been thought to be the picture in the National Gallery now called a “Boy with a Bird”, currently attributed to Titian or his workshop. Gould rejected the Padovanino attribution as “too precise”, while noting that this variant [Appendix IV, type J] selects the figure of Cupid from the left background of one of the versions of *Venus and Adonis* from Titian’s studio, omitting the wings.⁸²⁰ This particular representation of Cupid does not appear in all the versions of this subject from Titian’s workshop, as in most of them Cupid lies on his back as though asleep, but can be seen with the bird in the version formerly owned by Lord Arundel and copied by Peter Oliver (referred to above p.157). This seems to be the closest, although the same Cupid with bird also appears in the Washington and New York versions of Titian’s painting. The copy at Ham House does not contain the Cupid with the bird. The National Gallery painting deviates from van der Doort’s description in only containing one bird and consequently is unlikely to be the work he recorded.

Michael Cross or Miguel de la Cruz or Michel de la Croix was employed by Charles I in Spain to make copies of paintings in the collection of Philip IV, as noted by a number of contemporary sources.⁸²¹ The correspondence of the English Ambassador, Arthur Hopton, suggests that Cross was not from Madrid, while a source in Madrid in May 1635 when Cross was still in that city referred to ‘dos famosos pintores ingleses’ who were employed

⁸¹⁶ Van der Doort pp.84, (Appendix) 209.

⁸¹⁷ *Sale*, p.119.

⁸¹⁸ Van der Doort, p.6; *Sale*, p.265.

⁸¹⁹ *Sale*, p.311.

⁸²⁰ Gould, C., *National Gallery Catalogues: The Sixteenth-Century Italian Schools*, 1975, p.298.

⁸²¹ Bracken, S., *Cross, Michael* in *ODNB*; Bracken, S., ‘Copies of Old Master paintings in Charles I’s collection: the role of Michael Cross fl. 1632-60’, *BAJ*, III, 2002, pp.28-31 (“2002b”).

by the king of England to copy ‘las mejores imágenes’ in the Escorial.⁸²² No other painter in the king’s employment in Madrid has been traced and Hopton only ever refers to one, so we must assume that there was indeed only one.⁸²³ When Hopton returned to London he was refunded £691 5s. for the payments he had made to ‘Michael de La Croix His Maties Painter’ in May 1636 and Cross was given a reward of £110 by the king in August that year for ‘copping of pictures in Spain’.⁸²⁴ These sums suggest a substantial body of work. Malcolm Smuts has identified total exchequer payments to Cross of £801.⁸²⁵ The only copy by Cross recorded by van der Doort, however, was of a Raphael Madonna in the Escorial.⁸²⁶ It should be borne in mind though that van der Doort’s inventory is not complete. According to van der Doort (Appendix), this copy included the figure of St. John (probably the Baptist).⁸²⁷

Hopton’s correspondence refers to the copying of an altarpiece at ‘Aranjues’, which has been identified as Titian’s *Annunciation* [destroyed]; in the *Sale* documents ‘the Salutation: a Copy after. Tytsyan. at £15’ was sold to Harrison and others on 23 Oct. 1651, which could be this picture.⁸²⁸ Cross was also consulted about the intended donation of two paintings to Charles I, one being a Tintoretto (no subject is given) and the other ‘a Venus & Adonis of Luqueto’; no artist with a name resembling this appears in either van der Doort or the *Sale* documents.⁸²⁹ Du Gué Trapier suggested that “Luqueto” must be Luca Cambiaso, who worked for many years at the Escorial for Philip II, however, he is not noted for his mythological paintings and the artist referred to by Hopton may have to remain unidentified for certain; in any case, the suggested gift did not materialise.

In addition to the *Annunciation* above, copies attributed to Cross appear in the *Sale* documents six times, all of them after original works by Titian: The ‘heaven or paradise’ [i.e. “*La Gloria*” original formerly Escorial, now Prado] of which there was also a version in Buckingham’s collection; the *Last Supper* [original said by Wetthey to be in the Escorial]; the *Agony in the Garden* [there are two versions, but that in the Escorial is

⁸²² *Memorial Historico Español*, XIII, Madrid 1861, p. 184.

⁸²³ Du Gué Trapier, E., ‘Sir Arthur Hopton and the interchange of paintings between Spain and England in the seventeenth century’, *The Connoisseur*, 1967, 164, pp.239-243 and 165, pp.60-63.

⁸²⁴ TNA E403/2756 f43r, E403/2755 f64v.

⁸²⁵ Smuts, R.M., ‘Art and the material culture of majesty in early Stuart England’ in *The Stuart Court and Europe*, ed. R.M. Smuts, Cambridge, 1996, pp.86-112, 104.

⁸²⁶ Van der Doort p. 53, n.5.

⁸²⁷ Van der Doort (Appendix) p.206.

⁸²⁸ *Sale*, p.186.

⁸²⁹ No artist with this name is listed in Oxford Art Online.

proposed here]; *St. John* [the Baptist] ‘at Length’ [there are two versions, but that in the Escorial is proposed here]; *Mary Magdalene* [numerous versions, but one now lost was at the Escorial]; the *Burial of Christ* [Escorial; see below p.210].⁸³⁰ In addition, it is almost certainly the case that Cross is the author of ‘S^t Lawrence on ye gridiron; A Coppy after Tytsian’ which was sold on 1 Feb. 1652/3 at £15.⁸³¹ There are two versions of this subject by Titian, one of which is in the Escorial. The evidence suggests that all Cross’s time copying in Madrid was expended on making copies of the religious paintings in the Escorial, which is what was stated by the source in Madrid in 1635. In that case, Millar may have been mistaken in suggesting that the source of the copy of “La Gloria” in the king’s collection ‘was probably Cornelis Cort’s engraving’, as Cross would have been able to study the original for himself.⁸³²

As well as the *Mary Magdalene* copied by Cross, four further examples of that subject appear in the *Sale* documents, none of which is identified as a copy. Of these, one sold at £20 was described as ‘by Salviati or Titian’ and may be identifiable as ‘[770] Un quadro, copia della Madalena di Titiano’, which is the only copy after Titian included in the 1627 inventory of the Gonzaga collection.⁸³³ Twenty pounds was a very low price, compared with other works described as being by Titian. (Even copies of Titian attributed to Rubens were priced at £31 (p.177)). Of the seven other copies listed in *L’Elenco dei Beni 1621-27*, only one can clearly be identified in the *Sale*. In the Gonzaga documents this appears as ‘[817] Un quadro con dipinto il giudizio di Paris, copia di Rafaele, con cornice, stimato lire 12. F.’.⁸³⁴ In the *Sale* this appears as ‘The Jugm^t of parris; After Raphael’ estimated at £1.10s – no buyer is recorded.⁸³⁵ No painting of this subject by Raphael exists, but, as is well known, a print was made by Marcantonio Raimondi after what is assumed to be a design by Raphael. This proved to be very influential and it would be possible to produce a painting using the print as source material. That is likely to be the source for the painting owned by Charles I. The use of a print and the absence of an original painting would allow the copyist greater freedom in the production of his version.

⁸³⁰ *Sale* pp.186, 187, 188, 206, 301; Wethey I, p.97.

⁸³¹ To Baker, *Sale*, p.186.

⁸³² Van der Doort, p.233. A bas-relief copy also appears on p.100.

⁸³³ *Sale*, p.268. *Le Collezioni Gonzaga: L’Elenco dei Beni 1621-1627*, ed. R. Morselli, Milan/Mantua, 2000, p.277.

⁸³⁴ *L’Elenco* op. cit., p.281.

⁸³⁵ *Sale*, p.189.

There are several candidates in the *Sale* to be the copy by Cross of a Raphael Madonna mentioned by van der Doort; to give just one example: ‘A peece of Madona. Coppie after Raphell £6’. This can be contrasted with ‘The Madona. Done by Raphaell at £2000’, sold on 23 Oct. 1651.⁸³⁶ There were three other copies listed in the same section as the Cross copy of Raphael, all after Titian, although the copyists are not named in any of these cases.⁸³⁷ One of these copies is called: ‘The Marquis de Guasto a Coppie after Tytsyan’ (see below), which may be one of the two copies of this picture surviving in the Royal Collection. These have sometimes been attributed to Cross, for example, by Shearman, largely on the basis of attributions made in inventories after the Restoration. This is problematic, in view of the fact that nothing is known of his activities as a copyist in England where the original of this picture was situated at that time. There is also the difficulty that no signed copies by Cross survive, making any comparison on that basis impossible. One of these copies was restored and displayed at Hampton Court from 2000 and is of good quality, so if the attribution to Cross is valid, it demonstrates that he was a competent artist. Cross is named as the copyist of a picture of this subject in the inventory made for Charles II, as well as an *Adoration of the Magi*, after Titian, which is not otherwise noted in the documents.⁸³⁸

As mentioned above, there is a total of 47 clear references to copies in the *Sale* documents, excluding those cases in which doubt is expressed and excluding all portraits.⁸³⁹ Six of these are to paintings by Raphael, three after Correggio, one to a copy of a Caravaggio (which, as Oliver Millar observed, is probably after the *Madonna of Loreto* [S. Agostino, Rome]), one to a copy of a Leonardo, one to a copy of a Reni, one to a copy of a Veronese, one to a copy of a Bassano, four to copies after Brueghel, 21 after Titian. On this basis, one might conclude that Titian, rather than Raphael, was the king’s favourite artist. It was reported in 1636 that the king ‘ha molte quadri originale del Titiano’ and was ‘molto portato alle quadre di Raffaello d’Urbino che ammira sopra modo’.⁸⁴⁰ As in every other case, we have only reported speech and not his own words as evidence of the king’s artistic preferences. However, it may be true that he desired paintings by Raphael, but was only able to obtain them in very limited numbers or in the form of copies.

⁸³⁶ To Bass and others, *Sale*, p.305.

⁸³⁷ *Sale*, p. 276.

⁸³⁸ Royal Collection Surveyor’s Office c.1660.

⁸³⁹ Although there were probably other unidentified examples.

⁸⁴⁰ Lighthown op. cit., 1969, p.420.

Miniature copies were made of many of the paintings by Titian and one by Raphael in the king's collection by Peter Oliver, some of which are still in the Royal Collection. These provide further evidence of the king's particular fondness for certain paintings, where he owned the original, a miniature copy and full-scale copies as well. An example of this is the so-called *Allegory of the Marques del Vasto* (or d'Avalos) [Louvre] by Titian, of which a miniature copy by Oliver remains in the Royal Collection.⁸⁴¹ A miniature version signed and dated 1640 by David des Granges is in the collection at Ham House and there was another in the Hamilton collection (above p.174). In addition, two full-scale copies were made for the king, which may be those now in the Royal Collection (see above).⁸⁴² 'The Marquis de Guasto a Coppie after Tytsyan' was sold to Baker for £8 on 1 Feb 1652/3.⁸⁴³ Oppé was probably correct in identifying the sale of 'The family of y^e Marquess of Guasto. Sold to Col. Hutchinson 24 May 1650 for £51' as relating to the Oliver miniature copy.⁸⁴⁴ The copy sold to Baker could also be a reference to the *Allocution of the Marques del Vasto* [Louvre], the original of which also belonged to Charles I and was sold on 23 Oct. 1651 for £250.⁸⁴⁵

The Oliver miniature copy of the *Allegory*, if this identification is correct, seems to have been grouped for *Sale* together with other miniatures, possibly all by the same artist and all estimated at similarly high prices on 16 February 1649/50:

12. Venus and Mercury p^r Oliv^r at £50
after Correggio. Sold to Embry 21 May 1650

13. The family of y^e Marquess of Guasto. £50
Sold to Col. Hutchinson 24 May 1650 for £51.

14. A laked [sic] Venus in limneing by ye same Mr £50

15. The flying [sleeping] Venus after Coregio at £80

⁸⁴¹ Oppé, A.P., *English Drawings: Stuart and Georgian Periods in the Collection of H.M. the King at Windsor Castle*, 1950, no. 461.

⁸⁴² Shearman, 1983 nos.277, 278.

⁸⁴³ *Sale* p.276.

⁸⁴⁴ Oppé no. 461.

⁸⁴⁵ To Harrison & others, *Sale* p.313.

14 & 15 sold to G. Greene a/o 23 Oct. 1651

16. The Egiptian Madonna after Tytian £50

Sold to Embry 21 May 1650 ⁸⁴⁶

There follows shortly thereafter reference to ‘A lady & St Luke after Tytian 23 Oct. 1651 £80’.⁸⁴⁷ It seems probable that this was also a miniature; many other paintings in this part of the list are either described as small or are attributed to artists such as Elsheimer, who specialised in small, but not miniature, paintings. Miniature copies seem to have been consistently valued at higher prices than full-size copies, reflecting a particular taste for this technique perceived at the time as the glory of English painting. In his treatise (1627-48), Norgate commented upon Charles I commissioning miniature versions of history paintings, which had never been done before.⁸⁴⁸ Oliver’s nine miniature copies had been recorded as a group by van der Doort, kept in specially designed cases in the king’s ‘new erected Cabbonett roome...att Whitehall’; in each case he carefully refers back to the location of the original painting.⁸⁴⁹ Not all of these can be identified in *Sale*, but ‘The Egiptian Madonna’ is likely to be *The Rest on the Flight into Egypt*, of which the king also owned the original work by Titian (lost) and Hamilton owned a variant.⁸⁵⁰

The king also owned miniature copies by Oliver of paintings which belonged to his courtiers. The *Venus and Adonis* [Burghley House] of which the original belonged to Arundel has already been mentioned. There was also a copy by Oliver of the *Venus of Urbino* [miniature untraced], of which the earl of Pembroke was said to own the original.⁸⁵¹ This is clearly impossible, but might suggest that Pembroke was the owner of a copy of Titian’s original [Uffizi]. In the *Sale*, this is likely to be the ‘laked [sic] Venus in limneing by ye same Mr’ at £50, referred to above.

The king frequently called upon the advice of knowledgeable persons around him, including Inigo Jones, to give their opinions of paintings. In February, 1631, when:

⁸⁴⁶ *Sale* p.256.

⁸⁴⁷ To G. Greene a/o, *Sale*, p.257.

⁸⁴⁸ Norgate, E., *Miniatura or the Art of Limning*, eds. J.M. Muller and J. Murrell, 1997, p.89.

⁸⁴⁹ Van der Doort, pp.102-105.

⁸⁵⁰ Van der Doort, pp.103 and 17.

⁸⁵¹ Van der Doort, p.105.

‘my Lord ambassador’s four pictures were brought to Whitehall for the King and Queen to see. The King sent for Sir Henry Wotton to give his judgment of them...they be exceedingly commended and will continue Courtyars at Whitehall’.⁸⁵²

Although this episode is mentioned by Pearsall-Smith and Shakeshaft, they do not identify the pictures, although the ambassador in question is assumed to be Cottington.⁸⁵³ Van der Doort lists several pieces associated with Cottington. These include gifts from Cottington, such as a still life by Labrador ‘braecht bij melort kutinton vram span’, but these did not arrive until 1633.⁸⁵⁴ Cottington was also the donor of ‘the Nyne naked Musees and Nine other Musees in apperell, with some Poeticall gods by in the clouds’ by Perino del Vaga, apparently acquired from ‘the Marques Crescentius’.⁸⁵⁵ Giovanni Battista Crescenzi (1577-1635), was the Italian-born Superintendent of Works to Philip IV, and this painting was acquired in Madrid. Crescenzi had offered to sell nine paintings, including two Elsheimers, to Charles I, but the king was not in a position to pay for them.⁸⁵⁶

Pricing Copies in the Sale

The *Sale* of Charles I’s collection was not an auction conducted in the usual manner of those noted by De Marchi and van Miegroet in Antwerp and Amsterdam during the same period. In the first place, paintings were awarded to the king’s creditors in lieu of his debts to them; these include his tailor, plumber and glazier referred to above. After that, other purchasers were able to buy paintings for cash and these include several practising artists, some of whom became dealers, as well as Colonels Webb and Hutchinson, noted above. They did not, however, make these purchases by “open outcry”. Many of these purchasers, both creditors and cash buyers, then disposed of these goods in the secondary market, discussed below (pp.200-212). In almost every instance, the prices paid are either identical to the “estimates”, or only very slightly higher. The prices were not determined by the process of exposing the paintings for public view and then having public bidding at

⁸⁵² Pearsall-Smith, op. cit., I, p.210.

⁸⁵³ Shakeshaft, 1979, p.24.

⁸⁵⁴ Brown, J., ‘Artistic Relations between Spain and England 1604-55’ in *The Sale of the Century: Artistic Relations between Spain and Great Britain, 1604-55*, exh. cat. Prado, Madrid, 2002, p. 54.

⁸⁵⁵ Van der Doort pp. 21,36.

⁸⁵⁶ Shakeshaft, P., ‘Elsheimer and G.B. Crescenzi’, *BM*, 123, 1981, pp.550-551. Portier op. cit. is mistaken in dating the correspondence in 1614, before Crescenzi’s arrival in Madrid.

competing prices as one would expect at auction. Prices for works deemed to be original in *Sale* vary widely; to take two examples by Titian ‘the buriall Christ’ was priced at £120 in 1649, while *The Supper at Emmaus* fetched £600 in 1651.⁸⁵⁷ This variation cannot be to do with subject matter as both are religious, nor size, which is similar. It is possible that the higher price in 1651 is related to the interest shown by the agents of the kings of France and Spain and the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm. In the same year, original works by Correggio and Raphael sold for £1,000 and £2,000 respectively, while anonymous copies of paintings by these artists went for only £25 and £3 respectively.⁸⁵⁸ Examples of prices of works attributed to Rubens in the *Sale* are £150 or £60.⁸⁵⁹

We have almost no information about the original prices of the pictures when they were acquired by the king as the majority were bought from the Gonzaga collection for a lump sum. Payments by the king for copies are, with three exceptions, lump sums for various different pieces of work, incorporating other activities such as framing. The exceptions are two payments to Mytens and one to van Dyck. Mytens was paid £120 in 1625 for a copy of the *Venus del Pardo*, a work which does not appear in *Sale*, probably because it was given to Buckingham (lost). The other payment to Mytens was £40 for a copy of Palma Vecchio’s *Mystic Marriage*, in 1629, which was sold to Leemput in March 1650 for £8.⁸⁶⁰ Mytens is only otherwise recorded in the *Sale* documents in connection with portraits, some of which were copies. As mentioned in Chapter Two, the payment to van Dyck was £20 for making a replacement for the badly damaged Vitellius in the Caesars series and these are said by Symonds to have been given to the Spanish Ambassador (see below, p.205).

Most of the copies discussed here do not survive, other than some of the miniatures, and it is not possible to determine whether size was a factor in determining prices of copies at the *Sale*. In contrast to the prices for original works quoted above, copies by Cross of original works by Titian went for an average of £10, which is comparable to, or slightly higher than, copies attributed to other painters (or unattributed). The exception to this is Rubens, whose two copies of Titian mythologies went for £31 each.

⁸⁵⁷ These would still be considered original works. *Sale*, pp.70, 206.

⁸⁵⁸ *Sale*, p.305. The Raphael cannot be identified, but the Correggio is the *Jupiter and Antiope*. *Sale*, pp.71, 303.

⁸⁵⁹ pp.137 and 151.

⁸⁶⁰ *Sale* p.308.

Consequently, it is not possible to make the sort of comparisons illustrated by De Marchi and van Miegroet in their Table 2, since the price of the originals ‘as determined by producers in the first instance’ is not a factor in this case.⁸⁶¹ We only have information relating to the secondary, or even tertiary, market.

Ham House – a Case Study of a Seventeenth-Century Collection

The collection at Ham House has been selected as a case study in this thesis because of the remarkable survival there of several paintings which are seventeenth-century copies of sixteenth century Italian Old Masters. In contrast, none of the seventeenth-century collections discussed above survives intact. The paintings at Ham are first certainly recorded at the house in 1683 and a tradition has grown up around them that they were given to William Murray, at one time owner of the house, by Charles I. This cannot be substantiated by any facts and cannot be considered reliable, nor is there evidence of Murray’s personal interest in paintings. Some, but not all, of these paintings are copies of pictures in the king’s collection. Other copies in the collection at Ham are of works of which the king himself only possessed copies and not the original paintings [Appendix IV, types B and E]. The purported connection with the collection of Charles I is probably a tradition which dates from the second half of the twentieth century. It is particularly puzzling that such a tradition is not mentioned by Horace Walpole, whose niece Charlotte married the 5th Earl of Dysart and lived at Ham. Mrs. Charles Roundell, who wrote the two-volume *Ham House: Its history and art treasures* in 1904, does not mention these paintings at all. It is possible that they were acquired by Murray’s daughter Elizabeth (later Duchess of Lauderdale) in the burgeoning London art market of the 1650s (see below pp.200-212). The first guidebook to Ham House written after it came under the care of the National Trust does not mention this royal provenance, suggesting instead that: ‘the Lauderdales were anxious to create a splendid effect on the walls at the minimum cost’.⁸⁶² This may be borne out by their recorded purchase in the 1670s of the copies of the paintings by Polidoro da Caravaggio formerly in the king’s collection, a purchase which may represent a conscious return to the reign of Charles I. These are now set as overdoors in the Marble Dining Room and the Volury Room at Ham.

⁸⁶¹ 1996, pp.54,55.

⁸⁶² Edwards, R., & P. Ward-Jackson, *Ham House: a Guide*, 1950, p.25.

William Murray, later 1st Earl of Dysart (d. 1655), had been Charles I's "whipping boy" – i.e. the person who received physical punishment for the prince's misdemeanours. He was later amongst the group which joined Charles, Prince of Wales, and Buckingham in Madrid in 1623. It is known from other sources, not documents at Ham, that the king gave Murray a studio version of a van Dyck half-length portrait [still at Ham House].⁸⁶³ At least 16 studio versions of this portrait survive, so it was not an exclusive image nor a particularly significant gift.⁸⁶⁴ It is remarkable that it survives in its original frame.

In connection with Murray's putative interest in painting, it has been suggested that Orazio Gentileschi was referring to Murray in his letter of 1636 from London to Gio Antonio Sauli in Genoa: 'milo meri'.⁸⁶⁵ However, William Murray was not a lord and only became Earl of Dysart in 1651, after Gentileschi's death; it is just as likely that the reference is to John Murray, Lord Murray of Tynningham (d. 1640).⁸⁶⁶ The matter in which the king allegedly would not move without the advice of "meri" was diplomatic, not artistic, but in either case there is no supporting evidence for this to be Dysart. Murray, as a member of 'his Maj^{ty} Bedchamber' was the intermediary between the king, Norgate and Gerbier in negotiations with Jacob Jordaens concerning paintings for the Queen's Cabinet (Queen's House, Greenwich).⁸⁶⁷ In this context it should be noted that Murray was not consulted about the artistic aspects of these paintings, as the advice of Inigo Jones was sought. Murray's role was in respect of organising the financing of various artistic projects; this is clearly demonstrated by these documents, as for example in Gerbier's letter to Jones of December 1640: 'monney is lookt for by y^e said Jordaens; of w^{ch} I have given notice unto Mr. Norgate, who returned for answeare y^t Mr. Murrey had taken order on y^t point'.⁸⁶⁸ Another letter from Gerbier, this time addressed directly to Murray, in connection with possible purchases from Rubens's estate, is also mainly concerned with money: 'gelt is ye mayne matter' and goes on to ask Murray to intervene to get Gerbier's arrears paid.

The copies of Old Master paintings at Ham are first recorded in a document of 1683. Dysart had died in Edinburgh on 6 December 1655 and the first surviving inventory for

⁸⁶³ Carpenter, op. cit., p. 67.

⁸⁶⁴ Van Dyck, *Complete Catalogue*, IV.58.

⁸⁶⁵ Gallo, M.C., 'The Sauli collection, two unpublished letters and a portrait by Orazio Gentileschi', *BM*, 145, 2003, pp. 345-353, 353.

⁸⁶⁶ ODNB, p. 942.

⁸⁶⁷ Sainsbury 1859, pp.211-234.

⁸⁶⁸ Sainsbury 1859, p.234.

Ham appears to date from around this time and may have been compiled by his eldest daughter, Elizabeth, later Countess of Dysart in her own right.⁸⁶⁹ This document mentions only one unidentified painting, in the entrance hall, and none of the copies under discussion here. Subsequent inventories in 1677, 1679 and 1683 do not identify the paintings in any way, the number of paintings in individual rooms being the only information given. The copies are first listed clearly in the “Estimate” of paintings made in 1683, at a time when Elizabeth, now the widowed Duchess of Lauderdale, was thinking of using them to raise money. It was very unusual in England to have a separate list of paintings; most inventories incorporated all types of object, either on a room by room basis, or by type of object (sometimes with a separate list of plate). The two major exceptions prior to Ham 1683 were van der Doort’s 1639 inventory of the king’s collection and the inventory of the earl of Northumberland’s paintings drawn up by Symon Stone in 1671.⁸⁷⁰ Stone, however, omits the sizes, frame descriptions and detailed descriptions of the subject matter to be found in van der Doort. The Ham 1683 Estimate is not the sort of high-quality inventory that was produced by van der Doort, and some of the entries lack clarity. As a result, the ‘Titian and his Mistriss’, which was listed in the Gallery in one version of the Estimate, is listed on the stairs in the other. It has subsequently been mistakenly identified as the copy of *Venus and the Organist* now on the stairs. Peter Thornton and Maurice Tomlin in 1980 were unaware of the existence of the second copy of the Estimate and understandably remarked that it was ‘not known why this picture of a mythological scene should have been hung among the Long Gallery portraits’.⁸⁷¹ It seems extremely surprising that a composition like the *Venus and the Organist* could have been interpreted as *Titian and his Mistress*, when a well-known painting known by this title existed [a version survives in an English private collection] and van Dyck had made a painted copy of it, which was in London, and an etching, which survives in numerous versions.⁸⁷² Buckingham’s collection contained something similar as already mentioned.

The copies now at Ham are clearly not all by the same artist, despite the fact that the 1683 Estimate links two of them with the name of Michael Cross: “*Venus and a Satyr*”

⁸⁶⁹ Murray in *ODNB*, accessed online 7/12/08; ‘The Furnishing and Decoration of Ham House’, eds. P. Thornton and M. Tomlin, *Journal of the Furniture History Society*, XVI, 1980, (whole volume) where this inventory is dated c.1654.

⁸⁷⁰ Wood J., 1994, Appendix III.

⁸⁷¹ Thornton and Tomlin, op. cit., p.136.

⁸⁷² Wood, J., 1990, pp. 685, 689. *Anthony van Dyck as Printmaker*, exh. cat., Antwerp, 1999, no. 32. Van Dyck’s etching of *Titian and his Mistress* is BM R,1b.35.

presumably the *Venus del Pardo* copy and the “*Bathing of Diana*”, presumably the *Diana and Actaeon* copy. They cannot have been painted by the same artist as, despite the condition of the *Venus del Pardo* copy, which is not good, the *Diana and Actaeon* copy is of much higher quality. These descriptions in the Estimate do not inspire confidence as to the level of the knowledge of the painter Jan Wyck who compiled it. The copies in question are the following (those clearly listed in the 1683 Estimate are marked with an asterisk):

The Education of Cupid after Correggio *

[original, formerly in the collection of Charles I, now National Gallery, London]

Diana and Actaeon after Titian *

[original National Gallery/National Gallery of Scotland; Charles I owned three copies, but not the original]

The Venus del Pardo after Titian *

[original formerly in the collection of Charles I - Louvre, Paris]

Venus and Adonis after Titian*

[original Prado, Madrid, collection of Philip II; Charles I owned four copies of versions of this painting, but it is not known if they were all copies of the same version or copies of four different versions.]

Venus and the Organist after Titian (not clearly listed in the Estimate)

[original Prado, Madrid, collections of Emperor Rudolf II and Philip III – this is not a copy of the version formerly owned by Charles I (Prado)]

Miniature copies:

The ‘Allegory of the Marques del Vasto’ after Titian by David des Granges (signed
and dated 1640)

[full-scale original formerly in the collection of Charles I – Louvre, Paris]

Charles I also owned four copies of this painting: two full-scale and two miniature]

Danae after Hans Rottenhammer [original untraced – Charles I owned a version of it]

It is puzzling that the Estimate refers to the *Venus del Pardo* copy as merely ‘Venus & a Satyr’. A painting of precisely this subject (i.e. Venus and a Satyr alone) is not now at Ham House, but a copy of such a picture by Titian was then in the collection of the 10th Earl of Northumberland (now at Petworth House). Wood has suggested that this painting was altered from *Mars and Venus* to *Venus and a Satyr* between 1652 and 1671, which seems convincing.⁸⁷³

Examples of copies similar to those at Ham House are now further explored to demonstrate the possible origins of the collection at Ham. Further references to this possibility emerge in the next section.

In the *Sale* documents of Charles I’s collection, a ‘Venus. and Adonus: by Caratts.’ was sold to Gasparis on 21st May 1650 for £6. 5s., a price which suggests that this cannot have been an original work by a member of the Carracci family; a painting of this subject with this attribution is not recorded by van der Doort.⁸⁷⁴ An unattributed ‘Venus. bewaileing of Adonus’ was sold to Leemput on 7 Jan. (1650/1?) for £6. 10s.⁸⁷⁵ This makes an interesting contrast with the ‘Venus and Adonus. after Titian’ by [Peter] Oliver which was sold to Jan van Belcamp’s executors on 8 Oct 1651 for £80 [now Burghley House]. This much higher price is comparable to the price for his copy of Correggio’s *Education of Cupid* (noted above) which went for £50, and the generally higher prices for miniature copies in the *Sale*.⁸⁷⁶ As noted above in connection with the Arundel collection, there are many different versions of this composition, which originally emanated from Titian’s studio, as well as subsequent copies by other artists. In the *Sale* ‘Venus & Adonis. before ye Chimney coppye after Tytytan’ (unattributed) was sold on 19 November 1649 to Mallory for £27.⁸⁷⁷ The price is significantly less than that recorded for the Oliver cited above. This painting is not recorded by van der Doort. There were therefore at least three versions, which may have been full-size, as well as Oliver’s miniature copy in the king’s collection. A copy of Titian’s *Venus and Adonis* attributed to Cross was listed in the

⁸⁷³ Wood, J., 1994 p.285.

⁸⁷⁴ ‘Christ p^ringe in y^e Garden, done by Carat’ was sold to Col. Webb for £40, 25 Oct. 1649, *Sale*, p.63.

⁸⁷⁵ *Sale*, p.187.

⁸⁷⁶ *Sale* p.258.

⁸⁷⁷ *Sale* p.306.

inventory made for James II in about 1688.⁸⁷⁸ De Marchi and van Miegroet make the important point that ‘attribution...reflects shifting attitudes towards collecting...whether an atelier piece can count as an original, and so on’. Perhaps the name of the recently-deceased Oliver also influenced prices in the *Sale*.

Richard Greenbury, as ‘Painter to our dearest Consort the Queen’, made ‘one coppie of Venus & Mercury of the Corredgio’ in 1630-1.⁸⁷⁹ Perhaps he should be kept in mind as potentially the copyist of the *Education of Cupid* at Ham. It is puzzling that at Ham only one painting from pendant paintings originally in pairs in Charles I’s collection has been included, thus, *The Education of Cupid* is separated from its pendant *Jupiter and Antiope* and *Diana and Actaeon* from its pendant, *Diana and Callisto*. Van der Doort records a copy of Diana and Callisto as ‘de oder gret kallista...so big agin als te prinssipal’, indicating that this example is likely to have been made by tracing, but he does not record the copyist.⁸⁸⁰ As already mentioned, there was a copy of *Diana and Actaeon* attributed to Rubens in the *Sale* of Charles I’s collection (p.177). The copy of *Diana and Actaeon* at Ham cannot be by Rubens, but the existence of a copy by him now in a private English collection should be borne in mind, although it has only been recorded here since the C18th and its early provenance remains mysterious.⁸⁸¹ It has been suggested that this was commissioned from Rubens by Charles I, although there is no evidence to directly support this and the statement that as it is ‘not listed in Van der Doort’s inventory...[it] must have arrived in London after’ 1639 cannot be sustained, as the inventory does not cover all the royal residences and there are very many paintings in the *Sale* documents which do not appear in van der Doort. In addition, there are frequent errors in the *Sale* documents and this may fall into that category. For example, the reference to ‘Edward y^e 6th lookeing through. a hoole’ is of course a description of the anamorphic portrait [NPG, CR brand still visible on the back of the panel]. This painting is required to be viewed through a hole to correct the perspective.⁸⁸²

⁸⁷⁸ BL, Harley Ms 1890.

⁸⁷⁹ Wood 2000b p.128 transcribes the document in full. This payment includes several other pieces of work and the cost of individual items is not recorded.

⁸⁸⁰ Van der Doort, p.180.

⁸⁸¹ *Rubens: A House of Art*, op. cit., no. 5.

⁸⁸² This has some similarities to the skull in Holbein’s portrait of *The Ambassadors* (NG).

Another copy of a Titian, presumably after the original painting now in Boston, is ‘Europa. a. coppie after Tytsyan at £8 sold to Bass and others 19 Dec. 1651’.⁸⁸³ This could be the copy attributed to Cross ‘in the Earl of Kent’s collection’, which Vertue said was copy’d...admirably well’ [untraced].⁸⁸⁴ Charles I seems to have wanted to acquire Rubens’ copy of the *Rape of Europa* by Titian from the painter’s posthumous sale, but this wish was never realised. In addition, although not described as copies in the *Sale* documents, it is worth noting the presence of two unattributed paintings of ‘*Diana and Acteon*’ at Greenwich, valued at £30 and £25 respectively and sold on 1 Feb. 1653 which, combined with the version by Rubens already referred to means that Charles I owned three paintings of this subject.⁸⁸⁵ Charles I therefore owned copies of most of the *poesie* Titian had sent to Philip II, the principal exception being *Danae*, of which the small painting by Rottenhammer appears to be a variant, rather than a direct copy, if the version at Ham House reflects the same composition. Charles I owned three other paintings representing Danae, two of which are identified as copies in *Sale*.⁸⁸⁶ The copies at Ham are remarkable principally because their survival is unique and they are recorded in the same house since 1683. Despite the numbers of copies recorded in the other major contemporary collections, these do not survive.

In the next section, the availability of copies in the aftermarket of the sale of the king’s collection will be explored and some suggestions made as to their connections with comparable examples at Ham House in 1683.

Copies of Old Master Paintings on the London Market 1649-55

The origins of the collection at Ham House could be purchases made in London in the aftermath of the *Sale* of the king’s collection. Copies of Old Master paintings were widely available in London in the late 1640s and early 1650s as evidenced by Evelyn’s diary and the notebooks kept by Richard Symonds. In February 1649, Evelyn visited various ‘Virtuosos, the Paynter *La Neve*, who has an *Andromeda*, but I think it a Copy after *Vandike* from *Titian*, for the Orig(i)nal is in *France*’.⁸⁸⁷ This previously unnoticed

⁸⁸³ *Sale* p.321.

⁸⁸⁴ Vertue, II, p.147.

⁸⁸⁵ *Sale*, p.137.

⁸⁸⁶ *Sale*, pp.193, 276. The former may be by Palma Giovane (Shearman, 1983, no. 179).

⁸⁸⁷ *Diary*, II, p.548.

reference provides new evidence for the existence of copies of this painting on the London market. These copies need to be disentangled from the provenance of the original, which was also in London; the background is complex and will be summarised here.

What is usually assumed to have been the original may be the painting recorded in the former collection of Pompeo Leoni (c.1533-1608) in Madrid in 1609: ‘Una tabla grande de la Andromeda con Mercurio [sic] que mata un dragon que viene del Ticiano en quinientos y cinquenta reales’.⁸⁸⁸ Whether the words “que viene” refer to the sea-monster or whether they refer to the painter remains an open question; in the case of the latter, it may imply a copy. As noted by Kelly Helmstutler Di Dio in 2006, the descriptions in the 1613 Madrid inventory are much briefer than those in the 1609 document, but the same painting appears to be listed there, prior to the dispersal of this collection. More consideration should be given to the possibility that this was, in fact, a copy. Another *Andromeda* was listed in the 1609 and 1615 inventories of the part of the collection in Milan formerly belonging to Pompeo’s father, Leone Leoni, as by Titian, although in 1615 it was described as “tutta guasta”. Helmstutler di Dio writing in 2003 and again in 2009 suggests that Philip II may have given the Titian *Andromeda* to Leoni.⁸⁸⁹ The collection of Antonio Perez in 1585 contains a brief reference to a ‘quadro Grande de andronida [sic] encadenade y Preseo [sic] volando’ without an artist’s name.⁸⁹⁰ Angela Delaforce, in her study of the Perez collection, noted that the tradition that original works were a gift from Philip II to Perez was “improbable”.⁸⁹¹ The majority of paintings in the Perez collection seem in fact to have been copies of Italian masterpieces and in most cases the originals of these paintings can be demonstrated to have been elsewhere at the time, such as Titian’s equestrian portrait of Charles V [Prado] and Correggio’s *Jupiter and Antiope* [then in Mantua, now Louvre]. In view of the unusually high proportion of copies present in this collection, it may be questioned whether Perez in fact ever owned the original Titian *Perseus and Andromeda*. Pompeo Leoni owned a number of other copies, including one of Titian’s *Diana and Actaeon* [original National Gallery of Scotland]. In other instances, paintings in his

⁸⁸⁸ Helmstutler Di Dio, 2006; Wethey, III, no.30.

⁸⁸⁹ Helmstutler Di Dio, K., ‘Leone Leoni’s Collection in the Casa degli Omenoni, Milan: the inventory of 1609’ *BM*, 145, 2003, pp.572-578. idem, ‘Federico Borromeo and the collections of Leone and Pompeo Leoni: A new document’, *JoHoC*, 21, 2009, pp.1-15.

⁸⁹⁰ Delaforce, p.750.

⁸⁹¹ Delaforce op. cit., p.750.

collection have subsequently been identified as copies, but they were not noticed as such by the original appraisers.⁸⁹²

A painting, or preliminary sketch, of *Perseus and Andromeda* by Titian was drawn by van Dyck in his Italian Sketchbook [British Museum]. What appears to be the original painting was acquired by van Dyck in unknown circumstances; he also possessed his own copies after Titian, including the *Cupid Blindfolded by Venus* [Borghese, Rome].⁸⁹³ The *Perseus and Andromeda* was then purchased after van Dyck's death by the 10th Earl of Northumberland on 4th October 1645, together with *The Vendramin Family* [NG] for £200.⁸⁹⁴ Northumberland retained the latter, but appears to have disposed of the *Andromeda* quite quickly if Evelyn's comment is accurate, which it is likely to be as he was spending most of his time in France in this period. It was not at Northumberland's London house when Symonds visited the collection on 27th December 1652 and was shown round by 'Mr. Stone who coppys', or Symonds would certainly have remarked upon it, as he did the other works by Titian.⁸⁹⁵ One of Northumberland's servants sold some paintings in 1645 for £439, as noted by Jeremy Wood.⁸⁹⁶ However, although Wood asserts that this transaction included the *Andromeda*, the document is silent as to which paintings were sold and to whom. Northumberland also sold paintings in 1647, which were exported to Holland, but they are not identified in the document; this consignment could equally have included the Titian, since, as previously mentioned, it was in the Low Countries that there was a much more active art market than in London at this time. The *Andromeda* certainly has a French provenance, and it may be that seen by Constantijn Huygens in Paris in 1649. It is also likely to be the same as that subsequently in the de la Vrillière collection.⁸⁹⁷ The issue is complicated by the fact that an original is not recorded in the Spanish royal collection, but a copy was seen there in 1626 by Cassiano del Pozzo and is presumably the same as the copy recorded at number 1106 in the 1636 inventory of the Alcazar, Madrid, where it hung with original works by Titian [now in the Prado].⁸⁹⁸ Another copy was

⁸⁹² Finaldi, G., 'The 'Conversion of St. Paul' and other Works by Parmigianino in Pompeo Leoni's Collection', *BM*, 136, 1994, pp.110-112.

⁸⁹³ Penny, op. cit., p.220.

⁸⁹⁴ Wood, J., 'Van Dyck's 'Cabinet de Titien': the contents and dispersal of his collection', *BM*, 132, 1990, pp.680-695.

⁸⁹⁵ Beal op. cit., p.301.

⁸⁹⁶ Wood, J., 'Van Dyck and the Earl of Northumberland; Taste and Collecting in Stuart England', in *Van Dyck* 350, eds., S.J. Barnes and A.J. Wheelock, 1994, pp.281-324, 310.

⁸⁹⁷ Ingamells, J., 'Perseus and Andromeda': the provenance', *BM*, 124, 1982, pp.396-400.

⁸⁹⁸ Ingamells, J., *The Wallace Collection Catalogue of Pictures: I English, German, Italian, Spanish*, 1985, p.357. Wethey, III, no. 30. *Quadros y Otras Cosas, que tiene su Magestad Felipe IV en este Alcazar de*

purchased in Madrid by a collector from Seville in 1610.⁸⁹⁹ In addition, a version of this picture was seen by Symonds when he visited the collection of the painter Francesco Cairo in Milan in 1651. Jeremy Wood has suggested that the painting seen in Milan is the original.⁹⁰⁰ The fact that this is still recorded there in 1665 would seem to negate this possibility, as it contradicts the evidence from Paris, and Wood acknowledges that its status as ‘a copy cannot be entirely discounted’. His argument that ‘the dimensions agree very closely’ cannot be accepted as evidence of originality, as that was precisely what was desired by those commissioning and collecting copies in this period (other than miniatures). Exactly reproducing the dimensions of the original was the usual result of making a tracing.

Rudolf II acquired the *Ganymede* [Vienna] and the *Leda* [Berlin] by Correggio (his favourite artist), from Philip III in 1604, after copies of both were made by Eugenio Cajés.⁹⁰¹ Cajés was paid 1,500 reales for these on 19 August 1604 and Cassiano del Pozzo’s 1626 description shows that the copy of *Leda* was hanging with original *poesie* by Titian.⁹⁰² (See ill.16). As Helmstutler Di Dio pointed out in 2006, if the originals of *Jupiter and Io* and *Danae* were in the Leoni collection and still recorded there in 1613 they cannot have been acquired by Rudolf II, who died in 1612 and she suggested that the emperor Matthias may have acquired them, given their appearance in the 1621 inventory.⁹⁰³ It seems likely, therefore, that most paintings in the Leoni collection were in fact, not original works, but copies and that Evelyn’s comments about the *Perseus and Andromeda* he saw in London in 1649 were quite correct; he may have been aware that van Dyck had been the previous owner, hence the mention of his name.

In February, 1649, Evelyn went on to visit the painter and copyist Belcamp ‘Bellcan shewd us an excellent Copy of his Majesties Venus Sleeping, & the Satyre, with other figures; for now they had plunderd sold & dissipat(e)d a world of rare Paintings of the Kings & his

Madrid Año del 1636, Madrid 2007, p.184. It is also worth considering the possibility that as the genuine Titian *Adam and Eve* passed from the Perez collection into the royal collection, the copy of *Perseus and Andromeda* noted by Cassiano in 1626 and listed in the 1636 Alcazar inventory may have entered by the same route.

⁸⁹⁹ Falomir, M., ‘Artists’ Responses to the Emergence of Markets for Paintings in Spain, c.1600’, in *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe 1450-1705*, eds., N. De Marchi and H.J. van Miegroet, Turnhout, 2006, pp.135-161.

⁹⁰⁰ Wood, J., 1990, p.684.

⁹⁰¹ Delaforce op. cit.

⁹⁰² *Correggio* exh. cat. no. 26.

⁹⁰³ Helmstutler, 2006, p.158.

Loyall Subjects'.⁹⁰⁴ This is most likely to refer to a copy of Titian's so-called *Venus del Pardo* [Louvre], a gift from Philip IV to Charles, Prince of Wales in 1623.⁹⁰⁵ Belcamp, as deputy to van der Doort and his successor in 1640, would have had every opportunity of copying this painting in the collection of Charles I. There is a copy of this picture at Ham House. Daniel Mytens was paid in July 1625 for copying this picture (as noted above), which could conceivably be the version seen by Evelyn, or that may have been by Belcamp himself.⁹⁰⁶ The Mytens copy may very well be that recorded in 1635 at the Duke of Buckingham's Chelsea house: 'A peice of Venus Sleeping a Copy of Mitens'.⁹⁰⁷ Buckingham was likely to be the recipient of a gift from Charles I. Mytens cannot have been the author of the copy of the *Venus del Pardo* at Ham House. Colonel John Hutchinson acquired the original at the *Sale* of the king's collection for £600, thus becoming the purchaser of two quite different Venus types by Titian, before selling it on to the French Ambassador, Antoine de Bourdeaux for an enormous profit at £4,900. Hutchinson, who like Webb was not a creditor, was the largest cash purchaser at the *Sale*.⁹⁰⁸

Brotton and McGrath, in discussing the acquisitions made in London by Cárdenas, attribute to Symonds words which do not appear in his text, but which as a result misleadingly appear to allude to the original *Venus del Pardo*.⁹⁰⁹ Symonds was recording a visit to an unnamed merchant, who had bought numerous paintings in the secondary market (including from Belcamp's executors, who died in 1651). What Symonds actually says is:

'The Spanish Embassador hath bought. that were the Kings.
his bid in England –
A Cardinal sitting & 2 old men behind him...by Tintoret.
800^t he gave for it
The State gave him the 11 Cesars of Titian & ye 12th done
by Vandyke. Those cost the King 100^t a piece for w^{ch} he was
offerd 12 thousand pounds...

⁹⁰⁴ *Diary*, II, p.549.

⁹⁰⁵ Van der Doort p.19.

⁹⁰⁶ Sainsbury, 1859, p.358.

⁹⁰⁷ Jervis, op. cit., p.65.

⁹⁰⁸ Nuttall, W.L.F., 'King Charles I's Pictures and the Commonwealth Sale', *Apollo*, 82, 1965, pp. 302-309; *Sale* p.310; *Sale of the Century*, p. 66.

⁹⁰⁹ Brotton & McGrath, op. cit., p.7.

He has the famous Venus of Titians for w^{ch} the King was offerd
2500^t tis copyed by Walker'.⁹¹⁰

He does not mention Hutchinson, nor the price paid by Hutchinson at the *Sale*, nor does he mention Cárdenas by name. As Alexander Vergara has pointed out, a picture which appears to be the *Venus and the Organist* may in fact have been purchased by the Conde de Fuensaldaña, rather than by Cárdenas.⁹¹¹ What this does reveal is that when Symonds was writing, there were copies for sale in the aftermarket of both the *Venus and the Organist* (see below) and the *Venus del Pardo*. The original paintings had both been purchased at the *Sale* by Hutchinson and he sold them both on: the original *Venus and the Organist* to Fuensaldaña and the original *Venus del Pardo* to M. de Bourdeaux. Jeremy Wood stated that Belcamp died in 1652, but this does not tally with the reference in the *Sale* documents in October 1651 to his executors.⁹¹² Symonds mentions Belcamp as 'lately dead who kept the Kings picture a p.son or painter good at copying...[he] was under copyer to another Dutchman that did fondly Keepe the Kings pictures and when any Nobleman desird a copy, he directed him to Belcamp'.⁹¹³ Presumably, the "other Dutchman" is a reference to Abraham van der Doort, former keeper of the royal collection, who committed suicide in 1640 over a miniature which was thought to be lost.

As noted above, Richard Symonds had travelled widely in France and Italy and kept careful records of what he had seen; unfortunately, not all his foreign notebooks have survived.⁹¹⁴ He trained his "eye" in Rome, not only being accompanied on visits to collections by Canini, as discussed above, but also by studying his editions of Vasari and Baglione, as well as conversing with Poussin. Symonds' annotated copy of Vasari survives in the British Library.⁹¹⁵ Symonds was assiduous in making distinctions between originals and copies on his travels. By the time he was exploring what was available in London in the aftermath of the execution of Charles I and the commencement of the *Sale* of his pictures, Symonds was an experienced connoisseur and it is evident that he was especially interested in paintings which had formerly been in the royal collection. In 1651-2 he saw at "Mr.

⁹¹⁰ Beal, op. cit., p.310.

⁹¹¹ Vergara, W.A., 'The Count of Fuensaldaña and David Teniers: Their Purchases in London after the Civil War', *BM*, 131, 1989, pp.127-132.

⁹¹² Wood, J., 1994 p.301.

⁹¹³ Beal, op. cit., p.309.

⁹¹⁴ Millar 1967; Brookes op. cit.

⁹¹⁵ Beal op. cit. p.59.

Bayleys”: ‘The Satyr and Venus of Correggio copied miniature’ for £100, although the next words are ‘very small £80’ and it not entirely clear to what this refers.⁹¹⁶ It is probable that this is a reflection of his own thoughts and that he believed it was not worth more than £80. Van der Doort records a miniature of this subject after Correggio by Peter Oliver (Royal Collection), the original being in the Privy Lodgings at Whitehall.⁹¹⁷ On 20 Oct. 1649 Colonel Webb purchased at the *Sale* ‘A. naked. Venus. a. sleepe & a satyr. by her, by Isach Oliver.’ from Somerset House for £6, which could be this piece; the attribution to Isaac as opposed to Peter Oliver may be an error by the compilers of the *Sale* documents.⁹¹⁸ Six pounds would be an unusually low price for a miniature copy.

The original work by Correggio to which van der Doort and later Symonds refer is the *Jupiter and Antiope* [now Louvre].⁹¹⁹ At the beginning of this section, Symonds had already referred to Correggio’s ‘Venus standing & Mercury sits by teaching Cupid to read’ i.e. the *Education of Cupid* [now National Gallery] for sale at not less than £650.⁹²⁰ This price would have represented a loss versus the £800 listed in the *Sale* documents for 23 October 1651, when it was sold to Green or to Baggley; it was ultimately acquired by Cárdenas for a mere £400.⁹²¹ These prices reflect the going rates for original works, in contrast to Symonds’ comments on the correct price for a copy. Bayley is a misreading by Beal of Symonds’ handwriting for Bagley (or Baggley), the king’s glazier and a creditor, head of a dividend (or syndicate of creditors). This painting is recorded in the *Sale* documents as ‘received from Belcamp’, as are numerous others; it should not be forgotten that Belcamp was one of the specialist copyists and there is always the possibility that he was responsible for items which may not be originals. There is a copy of this painting at Ham House. The *Sale* documents record ‘A Coppie of Mercury teaching Cupid to read’, an anonymous version which came from Somerset House and was sold to Askue on 7th November 1649 for £11; this is not described as a miniature and could therefore be the version now at Ham.⁹²² As noted above, Greenbury was paid in 1630-1 for a copy of this picture, which could be the one referred to in this transaction. In addition, a miniature copy by Peter Oliver is recorded by van der Doort and it was sold to Embry (the king’s

⁹¹⁶ Beal op. cit., p.305.

⁹¹⁷ Van der Doort, p.104, 22.

⁹¹⁸ *Sale*, p.310.

⁹¹⁹ Van der Doort, p.22.

⁹²⁰ Beal op. cit., p.305.

⁹²¹ *Sale*, p.323. *Sale of the Century*, p.64.

⁹²² *Sale*, p.307.

plumber) on 21st May 1650 for £50.⁹²³ This price reflects the going rate for a miniature copy in most cases. There is also a miniature copy at Burghley House by John Hoskins, whose name does not appear in the *Sale* documents and who was principally employed by Charles I to copy portraits.⁹²⁴

Symonds' next recorded visit was to "Mr. Knightleyes" at the beginning of which section he referred to 'The Quadro of Corregio of Venus asleep & a Satyr Cupid also asleep' i.e. the *Jupiter and Antiope* [now Louvre] at £800, revealing that this picture had already been parted from its pendant *The Education of Cupid*, but he did not make the obvious connection to the miniature he had just mentioned at Bagley's, so perhaps these were two different paintings by Correggio. Knightley is not referred to in the *Sale* documents, but the painting may be identified as 'A Sleepeinge Venus, done by Coregio' sold to [David] Murray and others on 23rd October 1651 for £1,000.⁹²⁵ This is a higher price than that recorded for its pendant *The Education of Cupid*, despite the apparently "lascivious" subject matter of the *Jupiter and Antiope*. Knightley and David Murray were presumably joint members of the 2nd Dividend (or syndicate of creditors). Symonds refers to a 'sleeping Venus for wch was paid 480t' at Knightleyes being sold together with a portrait by 'Rafael' for £70 in November 1654, but this may not be the same picture.⁹²⁶ What may be a copy of the *Jupiter and Antiope*, 'The sleeping Venus after Coregio' was sold for £80.⁹²⁷ At this price, this may be a miniature.

Symonds also referred to seeing at "Mr. Cleyn" (Frans Cleyn, or Clein, the German-born designer employed at the Mortlake tapestry factory) 'A cobby done by his son, of a large Sacrifice done by Rafael wch was the Kings & done on pap colourd'; in this case, the fact that it was on paper may suggest that it was intended to be a tapestry cartoon and was a copy of one of the cartoons in the Royal Collection. Symonds also seems to refer to copies of copies, such as those still at Ham, when he referred to an unnamed painter 'who had a young man to cobby a piece of Titian's by S.M. Mag. done by one Crosse an Englishman who was sent by the King into Spaine to cobby it for there is the originall' at only £8.⁹²⁸

⁹²³ Van der Doort, p.104; *Sale*, p.256.

⁹²⁴ *The Cecil Family Collects: Four Centuries of Decorative Arts from Burghley House*, ed. O. Impey, Alexandria, Va., 1998, cat. 17. Van der Doort, *passim*.

⁹²⁵ *Sale*, p. 305.

⁹²⁶ Beal, *op. cit.*, p.306.

⁹²⁷ *Sale*, p.256.

⁹²⁸ Beal, *op. cit.*, pp.299, 305, 306.

Such a copy appeared in the *Sale* – see above. In fact, this picture exists in large numbers, some emanating from Titian's workshop.

Both Evelyn's and Symonds's notes provide clear evidence that a number of painters were acting as dealers at this time. When Symonds visited Robert Walker he was alert to the fact that Walker wanted £50 for 'ye copy of Titians woman naked & a man playing on the organ' [numerous versions were made in Titian's studio, but that formerly owned by Charles I is in the Prado], but that [Colonel] 'Hutchinson has the original', the latter being recorded as a purchase on 8th November 1649 for £165.⁹²⁹ On 12th November, 1649 'Venus playing on a[sic] Organ. Coppie after Tytsyan' was sold from Somerset House to Walker for £7.⁹³⁰ Despite this rather confused description of the picture, as Venus is not playing the organ herself, it must be the same and selling it on at £50 would have represented a substantial profit. The copyist is not named and could have been Walker himself, or this copy may have been made by Emmanuel de Critz, one of the five sons of the former Sergeant Painter, John de Critz I (died 1642).⁹³¹ In Symonds's notes he states that Walker 'cryes up Decreet for ye best painter in London'. Evelyn had seen what was presumably the same painting on 6th August 1650: 'passing by Mr. Walkers a good painters, he shew'd me an excellent Copie of *Titians*'.⁹³² Walker had painted Evelyn's portrait in July, 1649 [NPG] and consequently the two men knew each other.⁹³³ A print of the version of the *Venus and the Organist* owned by Charles I was dedicated to Evelyn and was issued by Richard Gaywood in 1656.⁹³⁴ There is a copy of the Titian *Venus and the Organist* at Ham House, but this is not the same picture as that in the royal collection, as the dog in the version owned by the king is replaced at Ham by Cupid.⁹³⁵ Shearman is mistaken in stating that Mytens copied this picture, as it was the Venus del Pardo which was known as 'The greate. Venus. de Pardo. done by Tytsyan', as was recorded when it was bought by Colonel Hutchinson (as already mentioned).⁹³⁶

⁹²⁹ Beal, op. cit., p.307, *Sale*, p.299.

⁹³⁰ *Sale*, p. 308. Walker is incorrectly indexed as "John".

⁹³¹ Walker was commended by Sanderson as a copyist (see above).

⁹³² *Diary*, III, p.15.

⁹³³ *Diary*, II, p.541.

⁹³⁴ Wethey III, p.200. Gaywood's print is BM 1877,0811.792.

⁹³⁵ There is also a copy in the Royal Collection, which was first certainly recorded in 1818, although the Charles II inventory mentions a version attributed to Cross with slightly different measurements (Shearman, 1983 no. 286).

⁹³⁶ *Sale* p. 310; 8 November 1649.

Walker also had for sale ‘Venus putting on her smock wch was the Kings’, by an unnamed artist at £63, which Symonds knew had been copied by “Mrs. Boardman”. Van der Doort records a similar painting in the privy lodgings at Whitehall as done by Titian, which was sold as such on 23rd October 1651 for only £25.⁹³⁷ Perhaps Walker had acquired it from the Dividend headed by George Greene. There are two pictures of this subject in the Royal Collection (Shearman nos. 297 and 298), neither of which is by Titian himself. As suggested by Shearman, no. 297 may have been acquired by the king in an exchange with the widowed Duchess of Buckingham, while no. 298 could be the copy by Mrs. Boardman.

At De Critz’s, amongst many paintings formerly in the royal collection, Symonds saw the ‘The Buriall of Or Savior copied by Crosse from Titian & on the Tombe is Bassi Rilievi & ye corner broken’; no price is given in Symonds’ notes.⁹³⁸ Fortunately, this detailed description allows the identification of the original copied by Cross as that in the Escorial [now Prado, inventory no. 440] (see ill. 14). There were two works by Titian of this subject in Charles I’s collection, neither of which is identified as a copy: ‘A Mantua Peece done by Tichian The Buriall of Christ conteyning 6. intire figu^{rs} Almost Soe bigg as y^e life’ and ‘A Mantua peece. done By Tichian the Picture where a farr of in the Landskiipp 2 Crossees be the disciples *buring* Christ being 6 intire figures Soe bigg as the life Christ being painted in Shortening and done upon Cloath’.⁹³⁹ One of these can be seen in the background of an anonymous painting with Jeffrey Hudson (Henrietta Maria’s dwarf), William, 3rd Earl of Pembroke, his brother Philip, later 4th Earl, Charles I and the queen (see ill. 15), which also includes Titian’s *Supper at Emmaus* [Louvre]. This ‘buriall’ was purchased at the *Sale* by Colonel Webb (as noted above), acquired by Everhard Jabach, sold to Louis XIV and is in the Louvre. No copy of this painting is recorded by van der Doort, but the *Sale* documents include references to four in different palaces: ‘The Buriall. of Christ; by Pott: After Tytsyan’, sold to Leemput on 17 May 1650 for £5 10s.; ‘The burial of Christ a Coppie after Titsyan’ £8 (no purchaser recorded); ‘The burial of Christ. a Coppie After Tytsyan. by Crosse £3 sold to Stone a/o 23 Oct. 1651’ and ‘A Coppie of ye burial of Christ after Tytsyan by [blank in document]’, which was sold to Leemput for £7 on 3rd May 1650.⁹⁴⁰ What appear to be the original paintings of Titian’s “other” burial, the *Supper at Emmaus* and the *Egyptian Madonna* were all bought by Houghton for a total of

⁹³⁷ Van der Doort, p.15.

⁹³⁸ Beal, op. cit., p.309.

⁹³⁹ Van der Doort, pp.15, 37.

⁹⁴⁰ *Sale*, pp. 191, 276, 301, 302.

£1,400.⁹⁴¹ He also bought: ‘A great peece of ye 9 Muses’ at £200 [Tintoretto, Royal Collection], at the same time as Cross’s copy of the *Gloria* for only £25.⁹⁴²

Symonds also noted that someone named “Buweral” at Temple Bar on 25 May 1654 sold ‘A piece of Abel killd by Cayn Copied from Titian by him...to Jo. Maryon for 400...in a frame guilt’. It is not clear whether the purchaser knew he had paid £400 for a copy, as the original was then still in S. Spirito in Isola, Venice. Mr. Fox at Standbridge had ‘a copy...of the Sposalitio of St Cath by Correggio’ for which he was offered £15 but ‘refused it’. It is difficult to determine whether this is the same copy which had been sold from the ‘privee. Lodgeings & Privy gallery at whitehall’ to Colonel Webb on 27 October 1649 for £25 (see above), but it seems likely.⁹⁴³ Webb was one of the significant cash purchasers at the *Sale*, but rapidly sold a number of them on.

Evelyn visited “Old” Jerome Lanier, uncle of Nicholas Lanier, Master of the King’s Music, who had been the agent for the purchase by Charles I of the Mantua paintings, in August 1652. He noted Jerome’s ‘rare Collection of Pictures, especialy those of *Julio Romanos*, which surely had ben the Kings...there were also excellent things of *Polydor*, *Guido*, *Raphael*, *Tintoret* &c.’.⁹⁴⁴ Jerome Lanier, as a creditor, is recorded in the *Sale* documents relating to the collection of Charles I as a purchaser on eleven occasions, including two works by Giulio and one by Polidoro da Caravaggio; these references do not include Guido Reni or Raphael. Jerome is also recorded as the acquirer of a ‘Laocon’ [sic] which, although not listed as such, was evidently a small copy; it only cost £1.⁹⁴⁵ Evelyn, who does not mention this piece of sculpture, was sufficiently interested to return to see the collection in January 1653. As noted by Jeremy Wood, Jerome Lanier sold three paintings formerly in the king’s collection to Northumberland in 1657.⁹⁴⁶ These, which included works by Giulio Romano and Polidoro da Caravaggio as noted by Evelyn, were all believed to be original works, although the *St. John the Baptist* [Royal Collection], is now thought to be by Correggio’s workshop. These were returned to Charles II in 1660, but not before they had been copied, as noted below. Nicholas Lanier, as a creditor, is recorded in the *Sale* documents twelve times, including the purchase of several Giulio Romanos, but none

⁹⁴¹ *Sale* p.206

⁹⁴² *Sale* p.206.

⁹⁴³ *Sale*, p.71.

⁹⁴⁴ *Diary*, III, p.75.

⁹⁴⁵ *Sale*, p.131.

⁹⁴⁶ Wood, J., 1994, p.297.

of the entries record copies. The Laniers' purchases are relatively modest compared with other artists such as Leemput, a cash purchaser and Emmanuel de Critz, the latter particularly evident as a dealer, but he was involved in several of the Dividends at the *Sale* of the collection of Charles I, which means that many of the purchases apparently recorded in the *Sale* documents were dispersed amongst the other members of his Dividend.

Artists as Copyists in London

A number of artists who were active as copyists in London can be traced in contemporary documents, although most of them are now little known. Michael Cross, the copyist employed by Charles I, is last recorded petitioning Charles II for restitution of his office in 1660, in which a promise was said to have been given the king at Caen.⁹⁴⁷ This may be an indication that Cross was in fact of French origin, which would link with the frequent references to him as La Croix, however, this remains unsubstantiated.

With the exceptions of Robert Walker, Remigius van Leemput and Jan van Belcamp, already discussed, the following painters were noted as copyists, by whom no copies of history paintings are known to survive. References in this period to female artists are rare, consequently, the absence of any further information about the "Mrs. Boardman" referred to as a copyist by Symonds (quoted above) is particularly regrettable. "Mrs." was a courtesy title and should not be interpreted as an indication that this woman was in fact married. George Geldorp (?1590-d.1665), came to London c. 1623 and is recorded in various sources as a copyist of portraits, mainly by van Dyck.

In addition to the Correggio and Titian copies mentioned above, Richard Greenbury is recorded by van der Doort as the copyist of Durer's self-portrait and portrait of his father: 'done by M^r Greenburie by the appoyntment of the Lord Marshall [Arundel] vor tu bi sent tu norembreh in rackompenz aufft prinsipals'. These paintings had been a diplomatic gift to Charles I and van der Doort's comment makes it clear that the intention was to repay the gift by sending copies out to Nuremburg.⁹⁴⁸ It is not known if these were sent. Smuts has identified exchequer payments to Greenbury of £750, although some of these are for

⁹⁴⁷ Sainsbury, W.N., 'Artists patronized by King Charles II', *Fine Arts Quarterly Review*, n.s. 2 (1867), pp.319-34.

⁹⁴⁸ Van der Doort, p.159.

repairs.⁹⁴⁹ The *Sale* documents of Charles I's collection refer to 'A picture of Diana & Kilista a copy after Grimbery; received from Belcamp. Sold to Geere 21 May 1650 £22'.⁹⁵⁰ This is a rather puzzling reference; whether they mean a copy by Greenbury, rather than after, or whether two words are missing between "after" and "Grimbery" cannot be determined. It seems highly unlikely that anyone would want a copy of a work by Greenbury if the attribution to him of a very poor copy of a painting by Annibale Carracci is correct. This is a painted copy of an engraving of *Christ and the Canaanite Woman* after Annibale Carracci [Magdalen College, Oxford], but this attribution was made merely by association with other work there known to be by him and is not supported by any contemporary references.⁹⁵¹ Thomas Locke wrote to Dudley Carleton in February 1625 to report that: 'The Marchants of the East India Companie had sett a Painter, called Greenebury, on worke to sett forth in a Table the whole manner of torturing the English at Amboyna & the matter with all circumstances should have bin acted in a playe verie shortlie'.⁹⁵² Fears of 'some tumulte' led to 'the staying of all, & the Marchants & the Paynter were checked for their labors'. As these objections were raised by 'Duch ministers', this clearly had the makings of a diplomatic incident.

Mr. Stone: Although there were clearly two Stones active as copyists, the more prolific is Symon Stone (fl. 1647-d.1676) for whom numerous payments are recorded; he was described as 'His Majesty's Picture Maker' in 1663.⁹⁵³ He was also recorded in the 1660s as a copyist of history paintings. From 1647 he can be associated with the Earl of Northumberland and as keeper of the pictures at Northumberland's London house. Stone showed the Northumberland collection to Richard Symonds in December 1652, when it was at Suffolk House (later Northumberland House). In June 1658, Evelyn visited the earl of Northumberland's collection there; his description is shorter than Symonds' but he accepted the attribution of a St. Catharine to 'Da Vinci' without comment.⁹⁵⁴ Evelyn does not mention Stone. Stone is recorded as copying Titian's *Ecce Homo*, *Cardinal Georges d'Armagnac and his Secretary Guillaume Philandrier* and a Palma Vecchio; as Wood notes, the copy of the *Ecce Homo* was presumably made before it left the country in 1647-

⁹⁴⁹ Smuts op. cit.

⁹⁵⁰ *Sale*, p.323.

⁹⁵¹ Boase, T.S.R., 'An English Copy of a Carracci Altarpiece', *JWCI*, 15, 1952, pp.253-255.

⁹⁵² Sainsbury 1859, pp.351-2.

⁹⁵³ Personal communication Jacob Simon.

⁹⁵⁴ *Diary*, III, p.216.

8.⁹⁵⁵ This means that Northumberland did not commission all of them; these copies have not been traced. When Northumberland returned some paintings formerly in the collection of Charles I to Charles II he had copies made by Stone; these include a Polidoro da Caravaggio and Correggio, as well as obtaining copies by Stone of most of the other Polidoros (then in the collection of Lord Lisle, who also returned pictures to Charles II).⁹⁵⁶ As noted above, there were also copies of these pictures at Ham House. Stone also copied van Dyck's *Cupid and Psyche* when it was in Lely's collection, before being returned to Charles II.⁹⁵⁷ The Earl of Bath paid Stone for such a copy on 29 August 1661.⁹⁵⁸ None of these copies has been traced.

Henry Stone, eldest son of the sculptor Nicholas Stone (d. 1647) is also recorded as a copyist and his career has often been confused with that of Symon, but prior to his death in 1653 Henry Stone is only noted as a portraitist and as supplier of fireplaces to Northumberland House in contemporary documents. He was apprenticed to his uncle, the architect Thomas de Keyser, in Amsterdam and then travelled with his brother Nicholas II from 1638 until 1642, dying in London in 1653.⁹⁵⁹ The diary kept by Nicholas during their travels reveals that whilst in Italy they spent a considerable amount of time making drawn copies after sculpture and paintings, although they were not permitted to learn the secret of making 'inlayd worke' (pietra dura) in Florence. In the Tribuna of the Uffizi they both copied 'a painting of Corregia', but it is not clear whether both were drawn copies; they were clearly well-informed about the paintings and the names of the artists. The copy of Michelangelo's *Pietà* in S. Spirito by Nanni di Bacci Bigio mentioned above (Chapter Two, p.78) was described as 'very well done', although the copyist is not named. As is well known, Nicholas later visited Bernini in Rome and was bold enough to show him some of his own drawings after Raphael.⁹⁶⁰ Unlike most of their contemporaries, the Stone brothers ventured away from the usual places to include Perugia, Macerata and Ancona on their trip, the two latter being quite exceptional among English travellers in this period. Stone was much less observant in Venice in June 1642 than Symonds would be a few years later, merely describing the Titian altarpiece as 'a deuine peece of Titianno of a

⁹⁵⁵ Wood, J., 1994, p.296.

⁹⁵⁶ Wood, J., 1994, p.298.

⁹⁵⁷ Wood, J., 1994, p.301.

⁹⁵⁸ *Van Dyck Catalogue Raisonné* no. IV.3.

⁹⁵⁹ White, A., 'A Biographical Dictionary of London Tomb Sculptors c.1560-1660', *Walpole Society*, LXI, 1999, pp. 113-115. idem, 'A Biographical Dictionary of London Tomb Sculptors: Addenda and Corrigenda', *Walpole Society*, 71, 2009, p.345.

⁹⁶⁰ Spiers op. cit. pp.162, 164, 165, 170-1.

St. Peeter Martyre', while reserving the highest praise for a Raphael in Bologna 'being the extreames rare peece that euer eye beheld'; presumably, the latter is the *S. Cecilia* altarpiece [Pinacoteca, Bologna]. Disappointingly, Stone records nothing more than that 'I spoke with Sr Guido Reni and se his worke'.⁹⁶¹ This is one of a number of instances in which Nicholas Stone the Younger refers to himself in the singular and does not mention his brother, Henry, which seems curious if Henry was the painter in the family. The account book which accompanies the diary lists numerous purchases of paper and chalk for drawing, as well as some prints after painters such as Raphael and architectural books.⁹⁶² Plaster casts of antique sculpture, one of the latter being in the Giustiniani collection, were purchased and more modern pieces by François Duquesnoy.⁹⁶³ The only technical comments in the Diary are about sculpture and there are no references to copying paintings.

After the *Sale* dispersed the collection of Charles I and the Arundel, Buckingham and Hamilton collections were also disposed of, the only authentic work by Titian which remained in England was a portrait, *The Vendramin Family*, which had been retained by the Earl of Northumberland. The only way in which artists in England could have familiarised themselves with his mythologies would have been through the survival of a few of the copies discussed here. This situation persisted into the eighteenth century. It may not have been easy to gain access to the collections at Ham House and Knole in which some of those copies remained.

Conclusion to Chapter Three

The story of collecting in London in the first half of the seventeenth century illustrates a special set of circumstances. A number of important collections were formed very quickly, rather than evolving slowly, sometimes as a result of bulk purchases. In each case there was a desire to own works by the most famous artists. These were mostly the great masters of the sixteenth century. Many of their works were unobtainable and the collectors discussed in this thesis were willing, like their counterparts elsewhere in Europe, to welcome copies into their collections as well as original works. In the absence of an active art market in London, most of the collectors were obliged to rely on the services of agents

⁹⁶¹ Spiers op. cit pp.182, 184.

⁹⁶² Spiers op. cit., pp.191, 193.

⁹⁶³ Spiers op. cit. pp. 195. 198.

abroad to make purchases for them, but there are relatively few examples of dishonesty which resulted from this practice. The outbreak of the Civil War and the king's execution, shortly to be followed by that of Hamilton, suddenly released an unprecedented number of collections onto the market, which had to form itself very quickly and unexpectedly. This is part of the reason why the Hamilton and Buckingham collections were sold abroad, where markets were much better developed. However, the evidence presented here reveals a lively, informal aftermarket in London and its possible links with the only surviving English collection of copies from this period at Ham House.

CONCLUSION TO THESIS

This thesis has taken a fresh look at aspects of the new field of collecting in seventeenth-century England. It has shown that pioneering, discriminating collectors already existed in the early years of the century, with a real desire to possess extraordinary objects which placed them at the forefront of the growing interest in Oriental objects. Having been confined to a tiny elite at the Hapsburg courts, these high status pieces became more widely available, partly due to the East India Company and expansion overseas. By the end of the seventeenth century this type of collecting would become known as “China mania”, but the early collectors discussed here have not previously been noticed and the case studies of Arundell of Wardour and the 1st Earl of Salisbury, together with transcriptions of unpublished inventories (Appendices II and III) demonstrate their hitherto unknown and innovatory acquisition of exceptional amounts of “exotica”. In addition, they kept their collections in new ways, formerly believed to have only begun about thirty years later. There is also evidence that the same collectors were amongst the first to develop a taste for Venetian paintings, which would become the focus for collecting in the next generation (Chapter Three).

Chapter Two explores the reception of copies in the great European collections and the attitudes of patrons and artists towards those copies. It examines the historical status of copying and shows that this was a long-established tradition, it demonstrates the importance of emulation and investigates some criticisms of copying. Those criticisms often revolved round the damaging methods which were frequently used, rather than the existence of the copies themselves. This chapter demonstrates the prominence of copies in collections, not only through their display amongst original works, but also because of their frequent use as diplomatic gifts, where the recipients knew that they were not receiving the originals. Evidence has been presented to demonstrate that cult images lost none of their aura (to quote Walter Benjamin again), through being copied and sent away to other locations. The role of gallery paintings in recording the presence of copies in certain collections and their own status as copies has also been included. The necessity for many collectors of employing agents and the potential dangers have also been explored. This thesis has shown that in the seventeenth century copies of works in the great Italian

tradition did not exist in a ghetto but, on the contrary, were sought after and placed with care in the company of much-admired original works on public display.

English collections are discussed in Chapter Three. Before the 1620s the canon of great masters of the sixteenth century was not fully understood, even though their names may have been recognised through the work of Haydocke and other writers cited above. Vasari was also known to a few, but his ideas about artistic development, competition and patronage had not yet been absorbed. Most inventories studied for this thesis in the late sixteenth century show a limited understanding of paintings and record little about them. The concept of such a thing as a copy and knowledge of the existence of the original, without which the copy has no real significance, concepts which presuppose full comprehension of ideas about originals and masterpieces, and the reasons why such a distinction might be significant, are absent. Hopeful attributions of works to Raphael can be found in the Lumley inventory of 1590, but this citation does not represent any real understanding of Raphael's key works; it was later to be stated that Raphael was Charles I's favourite artist, but by then he owned several works by this artist, as well as copies of them. It was in the reign of Charles I that real connoisseurial understanding was brought to bear and that masterpieces arrived in large numbers not only in the royal collection, but also those of others, such as Pembroke, Arundel, Buckingham and Hamilton. All of these collections contained copies of otherwise unobtainable history paintings by great artists of the recent past and those copies were generally recorded as such at the time. Modern identifications have generally been eschewed here in favour of the seventeenth-century judgements when the documents cited were written. This is also the period in which inventories begin to value paintings more highly, not necessarily in monetary terms, but in fully discussing them and van der Doort was the pioneer in this respect. There is a quantum leap forward in understanding between the 1605 Wardour Castle inventory [Appendix II] and van der Doort in 1639 in the descriptions and identifications of paintings. Contemporary commentators, who did not come from artistic backgrounds, such as Richard Symonds and John Evelyn reveal that this level of understanding had spread widely quite quickly. Their remarks, never intended for publication, provide an invaluable record of the burgeoning London market in art in the early 1650s, in which copies, many formerly owned by Charles I, played a vital role. The majority of the inventories studied for this thesis make no reference to prices and it is therefore almost impossible to discuss relationships between costs of acquisition and proceeds from subsequent sales. However, the

relationships between the prices of originals and those of copies at the Sale of Charles I's goods has been thoroughly explored, together with the prices observed in the aftermarket by Symonds and Evelyn. This has been related to the research of De Marchi and van Miegroet for the same period in the Low Countries.

Ham House, where the collection of copies is often said to have been formed as a direct consequence of a gift from Charles I has been chosen as a case study because it is the only collection where such copies from the seventeenth century (recorded in 1683) actually survive. The possibility that these were acquired in the aftermarket in London in the 1650s has been proposed and comparable works available on that market have been discussed. Finally, the activities of some of the known copyists active in London at that time have also been described.

The Civil War and execution of Charles I and the Duke of Hamilton and the dispersal of all the collections discussed here means that there was a changed world after the Restoration. Although Charles II endeavoured to get back as much of his father's collection as possible, he was not personally particularly interested in pictures and it was not until the reign of George IV that another monarch who can be truly described as a collector would be on the throne. None of the other collectors explored here had direct successors who were active in this field and there is a very real break between the first half and the second half of the century. It is in the second half of the century that public auctions would begin in London in earnest and with them would begin a rejection of the idea of the copy, as monetary values became the dominant factor and the notion of the autograph work of art would gradually take hold.

Previous studies of collecting have privileged original works and tended to ignore the existence of copies. This thesis has shown that they were highly prized, objects of status in the seventeenth century. Copies continued to be esteemed until the nineteenth century, despite the burgeoning art market and the changes in attitudes that resulted from it. This thesis has shown that far from owners of copies being deceived as to the nature of the works in their possession, their recognition and acquisition of copies of history paintings was crucial to comprehension of the great tradition of Italian painting.

APPENDIX ONE – ENGLISH INVENTORIES CONSULTED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS THESIS

Inventories which have been consulted are listed below in chronological order, with the family name or title in bold. Where possible, the most easily accessible printed version is listed; these may not always be completely reliable. Those marked * were listed in an article by M. Howard 'Inventories, Surveys and the History of Great Houses 1480-1640', *Architectural History*, 41, 1998, pp.14-29. Not all of those included here have proved fruitful for this study, but they may prove useful for other research.

- 1542: M. Hayward *The 1542 Inventory of Whitehall: The Palace and its Keeper*, 2v., 2004.
- 1544: *HMC Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L'Isle & Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place*, I, 1925, 'An Inventorye made by me Syr Willm. **Sydney**...', pp.273-278.
- 1545: W.C. Clark-Maxwell 'An Inventory of the Contents of Markeaton Hall....1545' *Derbyshire Archaeological and Natural History Society*, n.s. IV, 1930, 115-40.*
- 1547: *The Inventory of King **Henry VIII**: The Transcript*, v. I, 1998, ed. D. Starkey.
- 1548: W.S. Fitch, 'Inventory of Furniture at Mendham Hall 1548', *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and Natural History*, II, 1859, 242-7.
- 1549: Henry Ellis 'Inventories of Goods etc. in the Manor of Chesworth....taken 1549', *Sussex Archaeological Collections* XLIII, 1861, 120.* [**Seymour**]
- 1556: J. Evans, 'Extracts from the Private Account Book of Sir William **More**, of Loseley, in Surrey, in the time of Queen Mary and of Queen Elizabeth', *Archaeologia*, XXXVI, 1855, pp.288-310.*
- 1556: R. Garraway Rice, 'The Household Goods etc. of Sir John **Gage** of West Firle', *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, XLV, 1902, 114-27.*
- 1561: Rev. C.W. Bingham, 'Inventory of the Household and Personal Effect, Farm-Stock, &c. of Robert **Bingham** of Bingham's Melcombe, Dorset; dated 4th Elizabeth, A.D. 1561.' *Archaeological Journal*, XVII, p. 151-7.
- 1565: E.W. Crossly, 'A Temple Newsam Inventory 1565', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, XXV, 1920, 91.* [**Lennox**]
- 1566: J.L. Whitehead 'An inventory of the goods and chattels of Sir Richard **Worsley** of Appuldurcombe, A.D. 1566', *Papers and Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*, V, 1904-6, p. 288.
- 1575: Thelma E. Vernon, 'The Inventory of Sir Henry **Sharington**: Contents of Lacock

- House, 1575', *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine*, LXIII, 1968, 72-82.*
- 1577: W. Sandys, 'The Inventory of Archbishop **Parker**'s Goods at the time of his death', *Archaeologia*, XXX(i), 1844, pp.7-28.*
- 1577: F.W. Fairholt, 'On an Inventory of the Household Goods of Sir Thomas **Ramsey**, Lord Mayor of London 1577', *Archaeologia* 40, 1866, pp. 311-42*
- 1578: E. Goldring, 'The Earl of **Leicester**'s Inventory of Kenilworth Castle c. 1578', *English Heritage Historical Review*, II, 2007, pp.37-59
- 1581: G. Poulson, *The History and Antiquities of the Seigniory of Holderness* 1840 [**Boynnton**].
- 1582: S.I. Tucker, 'The Descent of the Manor of Sheffield', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, XXX, 1874, pp.251-263. [**Shrewsbury**]
- 1583: 'The Inventory of all the Goods....of William **Dallison**' *Archaeologia Cantiana* 15, 1883, 391-3.
- 1583: *HMC Report on the Manuscripts of Lord De L'Isle & Dudley Preserved at Penshurst Place*, I, 1925, 'Inventory of Household Furniture &c., at Kenilworth Castle, belonging to Robert Dudley, Earle of **Leicester**, An. Dom. 1583', pp.278-296.
- 1585: H. Michell Whitley, 'An Inventory of the Goods and Chattels of William **Shelley** of Michelgrove, 1585', *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, LV, 1912, pp.284-298.*
- 1585: *HMC Marquess of Bath*, vol. 5, Talbot, Dudley and Devereux Papers 1533-1659, 1980, pp.202-204, 207, 208, 219, 221-222, 224. [**Leicester** inventories of 1580, 1584, 1585, 1588]
- 1588: J.J. Cartwright, 'Inventory of the Goods of Sir Cotton **Gargrave**, of Nostell in 1588', *The Yorkshire Archaeological and Topographical Journal*, vol. XI, 1891. *
- 1588: 'Pictures of the Great Earl of **Leicester**', *Notes and Queries*, Third Series, v.2, 1862, pp. 201-202 and 224-226.
- 1588: L.G. Bolingbroke, 'Two Elizabethan Inventories', *Norfolk Archaeology*, XV, 1904, pp.91-108 [**Wodehouse**].
- 1589: F.R. Beecheno 'The **Sucklings**' House at Norwich', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 20, 1921, pp. 158-178.*
- 1590: C.L. Kingsford, 'Essex House, formerly Leicester House and Exeter Inn', *Archaeologia*, LXXIII, 1924, pp. 1-52 [**Leicester**].
- 1590 Cust, L., 'The **Lumley** Inventories', *Walpole Society*, 6, 1918 pp.15-35*.

D. Piper, 'The 1590 **Lumley** Inventory', *Burlington Magazine*, XC, 1957, pp. 224-31.

*Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age: The **Lumley** Inventory and Pedigree*, ed. M. Evans, 2010.

- 1591: S. Jervis, 'Five Early Inventories of Browsholme Hall', *Furniture History*, XXII, 1986*. [**Parker**; 1591 = 2; 1610; 1634 = 2].
- 1592: 'An Inventorie of all the Goodes that S^r John **Perott** had in the Castell of Carewe within the said countie the xxvijth day of Aprill 1592', *Archaeologia Cambrensis*, vol 12, 3rd series, 1866, pp.339-358.
- 1593: Sir Henry **Widdrington**, *Wills and Inventories at Durham*, II, Surtees Society, XXXVIII, 1860, pp. 226-29.
- 1596: J.G. Nichols, *The **Unton** Inventories*, 1841.
- late sixteenth century: 'A Beddington Inventory of Furniture, Sixteenth Century, *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, XXXII, 1919, pp.158-161 (**Carew**).
- 1600: R. Keen, 'Inventory of Richard **Hooker**, 1601', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, 70, 1956, pp.231-6.¹
- 1600: F.W. Steer and F.G. Emmison, 'Ingatestone Hall in 1600: An Inventory', *Essex Record Office Publications*, 22, 1954.* [**Petre**]
- 1601 *Of houshold stuff: the 1601 inventories of Bess of Hardwick*, 2001, [**Shrewsbury/Hardwick**]
- 1601: R.S. France 'An Inventory of the Goods of John **Cuerden** of Cuerden 1601', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire for the Year 1939*, 91, 1940.
- 1603: J. Gage, *The History and Antiquities of Hengrave*, 1822.* [**Kytson**]
- 1603: The Rev. Alfred Suckling, *The History and Antiquities of the County of Suffolk*, 2v., 1848 (inventory of Sir Thomas **Rous**)² *
- 1604: Rev. J. Raine, *The History and Antiquities of North Durham*, 1852 [**Reade**]
- 1605: G.C. Williamson, *George, 3rd Earl of **Cumberland***, Cambridge, 1920.
- 1605: **Arundell** of Wardour – see Appendix Two
- 1608: F.H. Cheetham 'Two Inventories at **Scarisbrick** Hall, Ormskirk, 1608 and

¹ although the article was entitled 1601 the inventory was taken 'the xxvjth of November 1600'.

² although the article was entitled 1602, the inventory was taken 'in the ffirst yere of the raigne of King James...'

1673', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire for the Year 1937*, 89, 1938.*

- 1609: A. Hussey, 'Faversham Household Inventory 1609', *Archaeologia Cantiana*, XXVII, 1905, 230-236 [**Aiscoughe**].
- 1610: Halliwell, J.O. *Ancient Inventories of Furniture, Pictures, Tapestry, Plate etc. Illustrative of the Domestic Manners of the English in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 1854, p.59-85. [**Symondes**].
- 1612: **Salisbury** – see Appendix Three
- 1614: Shirley, E.P. ed., 'An Inventory of the Effects of Henry Howard, K.G., Earl of **Northampton** taken on his death in 1614', *Archaeologia*, 42 1869, 347-78.
- 1615: 'A true & perfect inventorye of all the goodes & chattells of John **Fuller**...' *Sussex Notes and Queries*, 7, 1938-9, 201-4.
- 1616: 'An inventory of her Ma^{ties} stuffe in Otelandes taken at her Mat^{yes} remove in October 1616', East Sussex Record Office GLY 315. [**Anne of Denmark**]
- 1616: G.S. Steinman: 'The inventory of all and singuler, the goods, ...of the Right Honorable Henry Lord **Dacre**...' , *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London*, 2nd series, II, 1861-4, 27-33.
- 1617: 'An inventory of her Ma^{ts} owne stuffe in Oatelandes taken y^e day after her remove from thence being the 7th of October 1617', East Sussex Record Office GLY 319. [**Anne of Denmark**]
- 1618: E.P. Shirley, 'The Will, Inventories and Funeral Expenses of James **Montague**, Bishop of Winchester, anno 1618', *Archaeologia*, XLIV, 1873.
- 1619: M.T.W. Payne, 'An inventory of Queen Anne of Denmark's 'ornaments, furniture, householde stuffe, and other parcells' at Denmark House, 1619', *JoHoC*, 13, 2001, pp.23-44.
- 1620: J.P. Earwaker, 'Lancashire and Cheshire Wills and Inventories', *Chetham Society*, n.s. vol. 28, pp. 21-4. (Robert **Rufford**)
- 1623: Sir A. Heal 'A Great Country House in 1623', *BM*, lxxxii, 1943, pp.108-116. [**Sadleir**] *
- 1624: E.B. Saxton 'A Speke Inventory of 1624', *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, 97, 1946, pp.107-143 [**Norris**] *
- 1624: E. Peacock, 'Inventories made for Sir William and Sir Thomas **Fairfax** Knights of Walton and of Gilling Castle, Yorkshire in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries', *Archaeologia*, XLVIII, 1885, pp.121-156.
P. McEvansoneya 'An Unpublished Inventory of the **Hamilton** Collection in the

- 1620s and the Duke of Buckingham's pictures', *BM*, CXXIV, 1992, p. 526
- 1625: 'Edmund **Waring** of Lea Croft, Wolverhampton, Esq.,' *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries of London*, 2nd series, 6, 1873-6, pp.363-75.
- 1628: James Raine *A Brief Historical Account of the Episcopal Castle or Palace of Bishop Auckland*, Durham, 1852, p.75ff.
- 1629: Apethorpe House 20th April 1629 and 6th October 1691 as transcribed by Emily Cole [**Mildmay**].
- 1629: F.W. Steer 'The Inventory of Arthur **Coke**, of Bramfield, 1629', *Proceedings of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and Natural History*, XXV, 1952, pp. 264-287.
- 1633: G.R. Batho, 'The Household Papers of Henry Percy, 9th Earl of **Northumberland**', *Camden Society*, XCIII, 3rd series 1962, pp.75-118.
- 1633: H. Hulme, 'A Probate Inventory of Goods and Chattels of Sir John **Eliot**, Late Prisoner in the Tower, 1633', *Camden Miscellany XVI*, 1936, pp.i-viii, 1-15.
- 1635: Halliwell, J.O. *Ancient Inventories of Furniture, Pictures, Tapestry, Plate etc. Illustrative of the Domestic Manners of the English in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 1854 [**Lettice, Countess of Leicester**]
- 1636: H.L. Bradfer-Lawrence, 'Stiffkey alias Stewkey', *Norfolk Archaeology*, 23, 1929, pp. 308-335, [**Townshend**].
- 1638/9: F.W. Steer 'The Inventory of Anne, Viscountess **Dorchester**', *Notes & Queries*, CXCVIII, 1953.
- 1641: Cust, L., 'Notes on the Collections Formed by Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel and Surrey, K.G., II, *BM*, XX, 1911, pp. 97-100 and part III, XX, 1912, pp.233-236 and part IV, XX, 1912, pp.341-343 [**Countess of Arundel at Tart Hall**]
- 1643: J.D. Whitaker, *The History and Antiquities of the Deanery of Craven*, London 1805 [**Cumberland**]
- 1643: S.J. Madge, '**Worcester** House in the Strand', *Archaeologia*, 91, 1945, 157-80.
- 1654: Cust, L., 'Notes on the Collections Formed by Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel and Surrey, K.G.', *BM*, XIX, 1911, pp.278-286 and 323-325.
- 1666: 'Anne, Lady **Beauchamp**'s Inventory at Edington, Wiltshire', *The Wiltshire Archaeological & Natural History Magazine*, LVIII, 1963, pp.383-393.
- 1698: 'Inventory of the Goods of Sir Charles **Raleigh** of Downton 1698, *Wiltshire Archaeological Magazine*, XLII, 1922-4, 123-38.

An Inventorye of all the Ornaments / ymplemts and
household stuffe in Warder Castell Anstye
house and Shaston house taken the Xth of
August 1605¹

[N^o 239 – in a later hand]

- 1 **Imprimis** in the great Chamber fyve peeces of hanginges
of the Storye of Cypis, one drawing Tabell borde of
wallnutt, one dossen of Square stooles, one Turkey
Carpett, xij Cusshens of needell worke, one lyverye
Cubberd wth a cov[er]inge of watched velluett frenged
wth sylke and gould Two Crymson back chayers, one
Copper hanginge Candellstick, one payer of Copper
Andyrans and xxiiij^{tie} pictures of Popes & Emperors
A One pallett ffeather Bedd bolster one payer of
blanketts and a blew sylke quylte.

- 2 In the wth draweing Chamber fower peeces of Hanginges
of fforrest worke, one Shipp Bedsteede wth Twoe
matrices, the one of greene & yellowe [interlined] Saten of
Bridges, and the other of white Clothe and one Acheyney
Tabell borde guylde.

- 3 In the Chamber wth in the Gallerye fower peeces of
hanginges of Tapestrye, one redd Bedsteede with a Sparver over
of Crymsen velluett & cloth with Curtens of
Crymsen Taffytie and vallens [word erased] of Crymsen about
the Tester and foote: one ffeather Bedd bolster and
B ij pillowes, one Crymson saten quylte, one payer of
fusten blankettes, one crymson veller chayer & a lyttell [stoole ?]
one Turkey foote Carpett, one white marbell Tabell borde
wth a rich Carpett, the myddell of hym greene velvett & wth
the borders of sylke sylver and gould, one lyv[er]ye Cubbord
wth a Cubberd clothe of Crymsen vellett ij Crymsen
vellett wyndowe clothes layed about wth sylver lace
And in the pallett Chamber Two Couch Bedsteedes
wth out any furnytüre at all.

¹ The original document is kept at Wiltshire and Swindon Record Office, Trowbridge, no. 2667/22/2/1 and there is a typescript kept there which is not accurate. The original document is a parchment roll and consequently does not have page numbers, which have been inserted here for convenience.

The marginal numbers and letters appear in the original. While the numbers refer to the rooms, the significance of the letters remains mysterious, but they seem either to refer to bolsters or blankets.

Space fillers in the original have been indicated ---

On page 6 the handwriting changes – indicated at **.

On page 9 the room numbering sequence ends at **.

- 4 In the Gallerye one great lookeing glasse on a frame
 one lyttell Style glasse, one Turkey Bowe wth a
 quiver of arrowes, an Indyan weapon, an Indyan
 Ruffe[?], one Coker nutt, a Shell of the mother of pearle
 lxxxvj pictures of smale and great wth the poettes &
 pictures made in Allabaster, v mappes somewhat
 olde, one lyttell ladder vnder the great glasse, and
 an oystridge Egge hanginge in the myddell of
 the Gallerye.
- 5 In the yellowe Bedd Chamber iiijer peeces of orris
 hanginges of the Storye of the destructyon of Troye
 one Broade Bedsteede guylded wth a downe Bedd
 bolster Twoe pyllowes, ij mattryces, one yellowe damaske
 C quylte wth v Curtens and dubbell vallens at the Topp
 and singell vallens at the foote of the same, one paye[r]
 of fusten Blankettes, one white Rugge a Turkey
 foote Carpett, one Chayer & a stoole of Black & yellowe
 sylke, one lyvery Cubberd wth a Turkey Carpett
 of yellowe greene and blacke, one payer of Copper
 Andyrans And in the pallett Chamber one ffeather
 Bedd bolster one redd ~~[a payer of]~~ Blanketts, one yarne cou[er]led
 and a close stoole.
- 6 In the pyde horse Chamber iiijer peeces of guylte leather
 hanginges one lyv[er]ye Bedsteede wth a Canapie of
 Black velluett layde wth gould lace and frenge
 wth Curtens of black Taffytie and black velluett
 vallens layde about wth gould lace, one ffeather
 E Bedd bolster one pyllowe, one blew Rugge one payer
 of Cloth blankettes, an olde foote Carpett, one Chayer
 stoole, wth a longe windowe Cusshen of blacke veluett
 layde about wth gould lace, one Cubberd clothe
 and wyndowe clothe of the same, one lyv[er]ye Cubberd
 one payer of Copper Andyrans : And in the pallett
 Chamber, Twoe feather Beddes, one bolster one
 F G Spanysh blankett and a yarne Coverledd
- 7 In the Blew Bedd Chamber fower peeces of Tapestrye
 hanginges of the Storye of Hercules, & one other
 peece that was bought of m^r m^r [sic] Zowche, one
 standing Bedsteede wth a Tester and dubbell
 vallens at the Toppe embrodered uppon blew
 vellett & yellow clothe of Tyssew wth three curtens
 H of purpell Taffytie, one downe Bedd bolster
 and ij pillowes, one payer of fusten blankettes
 an olde Murrey Rugge, one blew Taffytie quylt
 one lyv[er]ye Cubberd wth a Turkey Carpett, one
 Chayer and a stoole of blew vellvett, one payer of
 Copper Andyrans And in the pallett Chamber

- one standinge Bedsttede guylded wth a murrey vellett
Canapie & blew Taffytie Curtens, one Downe
- I Bedd bolster and a pillowe wth a matrice
vnder the Bedd, one Cownterpointe or Covered
of Skarlett, one fusten blankett one lyttell
foldinge Tabell Borde an olde Chayer of Cloth
of Tyssew, and one Globe.
- In the Clossett wth in the blew Bedd Chamber one
Crymsen vellett Cubberd cloth embrodered
- 8 In m^r Charles Arundells Chamber, one standinge
Bedsteede wth a Tester & Vallens above of
Crymsen & white Saten wth 2 : olde Taffytie
Curtens & olde dornixe hanginges round about the
Chamber, one ffeather Bedd bolster and a pillowe
K one payer of woollen blankettes & a Crymsen Ruge
one lyttell Borde wth a Turkey Carpet And in
the pallett chamber A lyverye Bedsteede wth a
L ffeather Bedd bolster a payer of woollen blanketts
and an olde Covered of Dornixe.
- 9 In the Tower over Barbers Chamber all hanged
about with Dornix, one lyv[er]ye Bedsteede wth
a Canapie of Redd Saten embrodered Twoe
Crymsen Taffytie Curtens, one ffeather Bed
bolster and pyllowe one payer of woollen
M blankettes one yarne Covered of blew & Redd
and one lyv[er]ye Cubberde.
- 10 In the Tower over Mr. Charles Arundells Chamber,
All hanged about wth Dornix, one lyv[er]ye Bedsteed
wth a Canapie of greene saye wth yellowe
lace and bobbins, Twoe greene saye Curtenes
N one ffeather Bedd bolster and pillowe a payer
of woollen blankettes and ij dornix Coverledes &
one peece of Turkey Stuffe about v : yardes
- 11 In the fflower Bed Chamber one lyv[er]ye Bedsteede
a ffeather Bedd bolster one ~~and~~ blankett, and a
O Ruge of blew & yellowe, one old greene Carpett
& a ioyned fforme
- 12 In the utter Chamber wth out the fflower Bedd
Chamber one lyv[er]ye Bedsteede wth a ffeather
P Bedd bolster & two Cov[er]ledes thone of yarne and
thother of dornixe.
- 13 In the Clossett [~~Chamber~~] next the Chamber over
Barbers Chamber Two peeces of dornix Hanginges

- of blew and yellowe, one lyv[er]ye Bedsteed wth a Canapie of greene Saye, 2 : Curtenes one ffeather
- Q Bedd bolster and pillowe a payer of woollen blankettes a greene Rugge and a lyttell Dornix Carpett
- 14 In the Chamber over Barbers Chamber iiijer peeces of Tapestrye Hanginges one feyld Bedsteede wth a Toppe and vj Curtenes of blew Cloathe embrodered
- R one ffeather Bedd bolster 2 : pillowes a payer of woollen blankettes, an oringe colorr Rugge one lyv[er]ye Cubberd wth a paynted Carpett and [~~one payer of Copper Andyrans~~] in the Clossett wth in the Chamber one lyttle square borde wth a Turkey Carpett and an olde peece of Tapestrye Hanginges brought from Anstye
- 15 In the Myddell Chamber over Barbers Chamber one
- S ffeather Bedd bolster a payer of woollen blankettes and a yarne Covered of greene & Redd
- 16 In Barbers Chamber Twoe peeces of Tapestrye hangings A lyv[er]ye Bedsteede wth a Canapie of dornix and 2 Curtenes of dornix A ffeather Bedd bolster and
- T pillowe one payer of fusten blankettes and a Chequo[ur] Rugge of yellowe and blew, one black leather Chayer, a lyv[er]ye Cubberd and a paynted Carpett one payer of Copper Andyrans And in the pallett Chamber a ffeather Bedd bolster one blankett and a yarne Cov[er]led of redd and greene one crymsen Rugge wth greene and redd frenge one peece of Tapestry hanginges and a ioyned fforme.
- 17 In the Buttery Chamber one lyv[er]ye Bedsteede wth [an?] olde Canapie the Toppe blew velluett & the [curtens] blew mocadoe wth a ffeather Bed bolster and
- W a payer of woollen Blankettes.
- 18 In the Cookes Chamber one lyv[er]ye Bedsteede [~~wth an olde Canapie the Toppe~~
~~blew velvet~~]
- A ffeather Bedd a bolster 3 : blankettes one
- X yarne Cov[er]led of Red and blew and over the Bedsteede a peece of Tapstrye hanging w^{ch} app[er]teyneth to my lordes Chamber at Shaston [~~Anstye~~].
- 19 In the Chamber att the Vate[?] end one olde lyv[er]ye
- Y Bedsteede wth a ffeather Bed & bolster and an old Cov[er]led wherein the Scoollyan lyeth and a payer of woollen blankettes.

- 20 In the Appostles Chamber iij peeces of guylte
 leather hanginges one lyv[er]ye Bedsteede wth a Canapie
 Z of blew vellvett and clothe of gould wth Curtens of
 blew and yellowe Taffytie, one ffeather Bed Bolster &
 pillowe, a payer of wollen Blankettes & a white
 abc Rugge wth a Mattrice of corse Canvas, one ---
 Chayer and Cusshen of wrought velvett of ---
 popinioye greene, one lyv[er]ye Cubberd & a paynted
 Cubberd Cloth, one payer of Copper Andyrons
 And in the pallett Chamber twoe ffeather
 Beddes one bolster one blankett & a yarne
 Cov[er]led of Red and greene
- 21 In the Chamber by the Cowrte side in w^{ch} Mr. Tho:
 Arundell lyeth, iiij peeces of leavye[?] hanginges
 one pentice Bedsteede wth Tester and Curtens of
 d purpell cloth garded about wth velvett, one ffeather
 Bed, bolster & pyllowe, one payer of woollen blanketts
 & a white Rugge, one Truckell Bedsteede, one
 e ffeather Bed and bolster, a payer of blanketts and
 a Chequor [~~white~~] Rugge, one lyttell square Tabell borde wth
 a greene Carpett, one leather Chayer one ioyned
 [~~forme~~] stoole wth a Cusshen and a globe.
- 22 In the lyttell Chamber by the Cundytt : 4 peeces of guylt
 leather hanginges, one feyld Bedsteede wth a Tester
 and fyve Curtens of yellowe and red Carrell one
 f ffeather Bed bolster & pyllowe wth an vnder Mattrice
 of lockeram, one red mocadoe quylte one payer of
 blankettes, one Truckell Bedsteede wth a ffeather
 g Bedd and bolster one payer of wollen blankettes
 and a greene Rugge, one lyv[er]ye Cubberd wth a
 paynted Cubberd cloth, one lyttell back Chayer of
 cloth of gould, one lyttell lowe stoole cov[er]led wth
 greene cloth, one lyttell draweing Borde wth
 a Boxe and one Turkey longe Cusshen ---
 vnmade.
- 23 In the Chamber beneath the Cundytt where the Evydence
 Boxes stand, hanged wth three olde peeces of dornixe
 one lyv[er]ye [~~Cubberd~~] Bedsteede wth a Sackclothe ---
 bottome and an olde Sparver wth Byrds and Lyons, one
 h olde Cownterpoincte sutable, one ffeather Bedd and a
 woollen Blankett.

- 24 In the Colehowse Chamber twoe lyv[er]ye Bedsteedes wth two
 ik ffeather Beddes twoe Bolsters two payer of blankettes
 one yarne Cov[er]ledd of greene and Redd and one quylte
 of blew and yellowe mocadoe, one course Sumpter
 Cloth of blew wrought wth wolves & the borders
 Embroidered
- 25 In the Porters Lodge one lyv[er]ye Bedsteede one ffeather
 Bedd & a bolster a payer of blankettes, and one peece
 l of hanginges belonginge to Mr. Thomas Arundells Chamber
- 26 In my Ladye of South Chamber Twoe peeces of hanginges of
 fforrest worke one guylde Bedsteede wth a white Taffytie
 Canapie wth Curtens & vallens rownd aboute the feete
 m embrodered, one Cownterpointe of white damaske
 embrodered one ffeather Bed bolster and pillowe one
 payer of Busten blankettes, one Back Chayer & a Cusshen
 of sylke and crewell of dyvers colours wth my lordes
 armes one square Tabell borde of marbell in the myddest,
 one lyv[er]ye Cubberd wth a Turkey [~~Cusshen~~] Cou[er]inge, one Turkey
 foote Carpett and an other great Turkey Carpett used
 sometymes in the wardrobe, one playne lyv[er]ye pentice
 Bedsteede wth Tester and Curtens layde downe wth goulde
 lace and frenged, and one Cownterpointe of the same
 n sutable, one ffeather Bed bolster and pillowe wth a
 Sackcloth bottome, one payer of blankettes one payer
 of Copper Andyrans And in the pallett Chamber one
 lyv[er]ye Bedsteede wth a Canapie the Toppe of clothe of
 sylv[er] and the Curtens of watched Taffytie, one quylt
 of watched Taffytie, one ffeather Bedd bolster & pillowe
 one payer of woollen blankettes and a yarne Cov[er]led
 three peeces of Tapestrye hanginges wth a lyttell square
 borde and a Turkey Cov[er]inge.
- 27 In the great p[ar]lor Two round Tabell Bordes of marbell
 one longe, one longe Tabell borde Two lyv[er]ye Cubberdes
 In the upper Storye xvij pictures, in the second storye
 vij pictures & xvj Senato[u]rs Heades and in the neather story
 xxij pictures whereof ij have Taffytie Curtens, Twoe
 greene Carpettes frenged, fflower great Chayers, Twoe lyttell
 back Chayers, one dossen of iij Corner stooles, one Copper
 hanginge Candellsticke, one payer of Copper Andyrans
 one fyer shovell, a ioyned forme, one lyttell green square
 vellvett stoole one great foote Carpett of Cammelles hayer
 bought of Sr Wm Clavell** one dossen & ix Cushens whereof
 nyne of my lordes Armes, 3. wth the wolfe, in the
 myddeste, iij wth the Crowne, 3. wth the rose, and thother
 3 : turkey Cushens whiche came from Moortlake.

- 28 In the wth drawinge p[ar]lor fower peeces of guylte leather hanginges whereof one of them hathe the pycture of Christe, fyve greate pyctures, one Tabell Boorde of Marbell in the myddle wth a turkey Carpett, one lyttle square Tabell boorde wthout a Carpett, one lyv[er]ie Cubberd wth leaves and a turkey Cubberde Clothe of yeallowe, greene and blacke one standyng Cubberde for the vyrginalles one blacke wroughte velvett Chayre and fower Stooles sutable, one crymsyn satan [~~chaye~~] Chayre ymbrodered one other popeniaye greene Chaire p[ar]tlye ymbrodered one other Chayre of clothe of gooulde Twoe lyttle blewe backe Chayres wth twoe lowe square Stooles wroughte wacthed stuffe, twoe highe stooles of Cloathe of goulde frenged, one persynge Carpett, Twoe longe goulde Cushens, twoe other longe Cushens ymbrodered vpon Crymson satan, one longe needle woorke Cushen of sylke and sylver of the storye of Susanna, one wyndowe Curten of greene saye, one wyndowe Cloathe of greene velvett frenged, and one payer of Copper Andyrons.
- 29 In : the Haulfespace betweene the p[ar]lor and Hawle fower greate pyctures and one greene Curten.
- 30 In the Hawle fyve greate pyctures in the ov[er?] fronte, and three pyctures in the Lower fronte, three longe Table boordes, twoe longe fformes, and three shorte fformes, two lyttle Candle stickes and one lyv[er]ie Cubberde.
- 31 In the Chamber by the Chapple where my Ladye lyethe fflower peeces of Tapestrye hanginges one sparver Bedsteed wth a sparver ov[er] ytt of blacke velvett ymbrodered wth Curtens, dubbell vallens att the toppe and syngle vallens for the ffoote sutable. One downe Bedd & bolster and two pyllowes, one pair of ffustian Blanckettes, and one clothe Blanckett, one yeallowe rugge, one Crymson grograyne Quilte, one ffoote turkey Carpett one Table of Rawnuc... [?] wth a Coverynge of blewe and greene stuffe, one liv[er]ye Cubberde one lyttle square Tabell boorde, one Curten of blacke stuffe for the wyndowe nexte the garden, one paynted Clothe for the square Boorde, twoe painted wyndowe Clothes, one Curten of Dorenix for the wyndowe nexte the Courte, one backe stoole of blewe velvett, twoe pyctures one square highe stoole of blewe velvett, and twoe lyttle lowe boordes ioyned, And in the pallett chamber
- q One ffeather bedd, bolster a paire of blanckettes and a yarne Coverled and one peece of Dornix hanginges.
- 32 In the Chapple one white Marbell boorde.
- 33 In the Wardrobe twoe peces of riche hangeinges of sylke sylver and goulde, fower peeces of Tapestrye hangeinges of

fforeste worcke, one Cownterpoincte of wacthed Damaske
 embrodered, twoe other Cownterpointes wroughte wth barke
 of tree vpon Callicoe, A Canapye, & Curtens sutable of
 the same stuffe one white Taffetye Cushen ymbrodered
 Twoe longe needle worcke Cushens of sylke sylver and
 goulde, Twoe other longe needell woorke Cushens ---
 wroughte wth sylke, one Dossen of square Cushens
 wrought wth sylke and goulde, one lyttle square cushen
 of Orrys vnmade, Twoe Cushens wroughte wth Crewell
 thone of them unmade, six Cushens of greene Clothe
 ymbrodered vnmade, wth a Carpett of the same vnmade
 One longe Crymson satan Cushen embrodered wth
 Dyamondes, one square Cushen of needle worke wth
 Sr ffrancis Wyllughbeyes armes, one other square
 Cushen wroughte wth sylke sylver & goulde bottomed
 wth Tawney velvett, one other square Cushen of
 needle worcke wroughte wth knottes of redd & yeallowe
 sylke & bottomed wth yeallowe satan, one olde square
 Cushen wroughte wth Crewell, one Toppe for a
 ffeilde bedd vnmade conteyninge fower peeces wth
 vallens of blacke velvett ymbrodered wth sylver
 and goulde, one lyttle mantell of needle worcke
 wroughte vpon Callicoe wth barke of tree one
 paynted narrowe Clothe, twoe peeces of Clothe of ~~goulde~~ goulde
 somewhat worne, Twoe lyttle pyllowe Cushens
 ymbrodered vpon white satan, Twoe polles of crimson
 brode Taffetye somewhat worne conteyninge aboute
 4 yeardes, one wyndowe Clothe, a coverynge for a
 lyverie Cubberd vnmade embrodered upon whyte
 Taffetye, wth twoe lyttle polles of the same stuffe
 appointed for a Chaire, twoe liv[er]ye Cloake ~~eth~~ clothes
 wth stuffe vnmade, twoe payre of vallens wth bobens
 and fyve Curtens of greene saye, one Coverynge wth
 fyve Curtens of blewe Clothe laide downe wth yellow
 sylke lace for a pentice bedd w^{ch} came from Mortlake
 wth single vallens for the same, Twoe Curtens of
 greene saye, one greene wyndowe Clothe frenged
 one olde Tester of greene velvett wth three^[interlined] vallens
 sutable One longe needle worcke Carpett wroughte wth my
 Lords Armes one longe Dornix Carpett, one olde
 yeallowe quilte of Cavell, v. stamell horsemens
 Bases and one souldyers Coate, one blacke velvett
 ffootecloathe one Crymson velvett Turkey Saddell
 layde aboute wth goulde lace one payre of Copper
 Styroppes, one payer of Copper Andyrans whereof one
 wanteth his foofte, one Cubberd Clothe and wyndow
 Clothe of greene velvett frenged, one olde satan
 Cushen ymbrodered, three olde taffetye Curtens
 of greene, one Crossbowe wth three Arrowes, fower
 brasse warmynge pannes, twoe olde Chayres, twoe

greate Chestes & one lyttle Truncke, one brode boorde
to laie the stuff vpon and one blacke velvett ---
Saddle laide about wth goulde lace wth a leather
Coverynge.

- 34 In the Stewardes Chamber one ffeilde beddsteede wth
Tester and fower Curtens of greene saye, one
r ffeather bedd bolster & a pyllowe 3 : blanckettes
a greene rugge, one pallett ffeather bedd and
s Bolster a paire of blanckettes, one olde greate
Chayre & an olde square tabell boorde.
- 35 In the Chamber ov[er] the Stewardes Chamber A [~~lyv~~]
lyv[er]ie Bedsteede wth Canapie & twoe Curtens of
tu Dornix twoe ffeather Bedds one bolster a pyllowe one
payre of blanckettes and a whyte rugge and one yearne
Coverledd myxed wth wacted and redd & an olde
velvett Chayre ymbodered
- xx In the Chamber ov[er] the Stable In Wm Wychers Chamber
a lyv[er]ye Bedsteede a ffeather bedd a bolster a paire
of blanckettes a yearne Coverled and An olde Close
Stoole, In Thomas Coachemans Chamber one lyv[er]ie ---
Bedsteede, one ffeather bed a bolster, a paire of
blanckettes, a white rugge and one peece of Dornix
hangeinges. In Roberte ffoyles Chamber A lyv[er]ie
Bedsteede one ffeather bed A bolster a paire of
blanckettes and a Crymson rugge. In Tho : Morleys
Chamber one lyv[er]ie bedsteede A ffeather bed, a bolster
A payre of blanckettes and A Crymson rugge. In Wm
Mounkes Chamber A lyv[er]ie bedsteede one ffeather
Bedd, A bolster A payre of blanckettes and A streaked
Cov[er]led, in Rychard Cantles chamber one lyv[er]ie bed
steede, A ffeather bedd a bolster, a paire of blankettes
amd a yarne Coverled. In Tho : Symes Chamber
one lyv[er]ie bedsteede a ffeather bedd A bolster A
payre of blanckettes and a red yarne Cov[er]led.
- In Rychard Pearce his Chamber in the Brewhouse one
Lyv[er]ie Bedsteede Twoe ffeather beds twoe bolsters
three blanckettes and twoe Cov[er]leds.
- In the Gardyn[er]s Chamber one lyv[er]ie Bedsteede A feather
Bed a bolster, A little pyllowe A payre of blanckettes
and A yarne Cov[er]led.
- In the passage betweene the wthdraweing Chamber
and the red bed Chamber, one ffeather bed bolster A
paire of blanckettes and a white rugge.

In Thomas Wylsons handes lente by my Ladie one ---
 ffether bed A bolster and a pyllowe A paire of
 woollen Blanckettes and a greene rugge, one yarne
 Cov[er]led, one Canopie of Dornix wth twoe Curtens
 one peece of Dornix to laye vpon the walle, one
 Leather Chaire twoe Cushens and a Chamber potte.

In the possylen house

Inprimis in the Chardge of John Cooke twoe [creame]
 Creame dysches garnyshed twoe earthen sallett
 dysches and one greate platter of possylen, one dossen
 of fruite dysches enamelled of brasse twoe butter
 dysches & fower saucers of possylen, And in Clarencia
 her Chardge fower sawcers and one Butter dyshe
 of possylen for my Ladies vse, And in Thomas Morleys
 Chardge twoe basons and Ewers of earthe vsed in
 Chambers wth lyv[er]ie.

Item in X[t]ofer Mercers Chardge one basen and
 Ewre of possylen wth a bulls head garnyshed, one greate
 possylen basen garnyshed, twoe possylen Creame dysches
 garnished, one greate possylen bottle garnyshed one
 little possylen bottle garnished, one possilen Cuppe
 garnished one wycker Cuppe garnished one Basen
 and Ewre of brasse enamelled wth his Case, one dossen
 of Trenchar plates enamelled wth a Case, one Salte
 of brasse enamelled twoe marbell Candlestickes gylte
 one painted basen and Ewre of earthe wth greene
 twoe greate possylen basens, twoe little longe possilen
 bottells twoe little bolles & one [~~salte~~] salte of marbell
 gylde, one Marbell Candlesticke broken, one
 Marbell Salte the foote somewhat broken fower
 earthen spoones painted, one sugar spoone of bone
 one broken spoone the handle of mother of pearle
 Twoe greate possylen botles twoe earthen bottles
 painted twoe lyttle Creame dishes of possylen ---
 vngarnished, eighte possylen fruite dysches of one
 sorte the sydes unpainted, one dossen of other ---
 possylen dishes all painted twelve possylen platte^{rs}
 fowerteene possylen pottingers, twoe basens & Ewres
 of possylen vngarnished, one basen & Ewre of earthe
 painted, one washenge Basen of earthe painted
 one earthe fruyte dishe painted wth a woorme in the
 myddeste, twoe possylen sallett dishes, twentye
 possilen porridge dishes, fower little possilen creame
 dysches xxviij fruite & sallett possilen dishes xxij^{tie}
 possylen Sawcers, one boninge painted boxe wth
 Toothe pyckers, Nyne wycker sawcers some painted
 and gylde wth a boxe, three earthen painted fruite

dishes, twoe greate red painted voyders, twoe greate
 blacke painted voyders, twoe wallnutt platters an
 Indyan barbers boxe, an yndian Shadowe, xiiijteen
 staves, eighte of them wth rownde Knappes in the
 ende, one bonyng Carved salte, one little blacke
 Rod wth a picture in the ende.

Twoe Tinne vennys glasses p[ar]cell guilte
 Three wyne Vennys glasses
 One greate vennys glasse
 Twoe other beere vennys glasses
 Twoe greate greene bottle glasses
 One vennys glasse bottle wickered

Plate remanyninge att Wardo[u]r

Inprimis in my ladies Custodie of her own plate one
 deepe sylver Basen wth a Ewre Cov[er]ed, twoe longe
 fflaunders sylver pottes for beere wth Covers, one other
 beere pott, one smale sylver salte wth a Cover, twoe
 sylver Tunnes, Twoe sylver Candlestickes one magdla[n?]
 Cuppe wth A Cover twoe sylver bolles wth theire ---
 Covers, A sugar boxe wth his Cover A Chaffendishe
 of Sylver, an eye Cuppe of sylver, A sylver skillett
 one Casting bottell guilte, a Silver Collander wth
 A longe handle for p[er] servinges[?] & fyve silver spoones.

In Thomas Morleys custodie for thuse of the house one
 sylver basen with his Ewer chased ~~one sugar boxe wth A~~
~~salte att the tope and one [little]~~ one dossen of sylver spoons with
 gylt knappe engraven with the wolfe

Twoe sylver Crocke Candlestickes, one greate Salte
 wth his cover double gilte One little trencharde
 Salte wthout A Cover double gylte

In John Cookes custodie for thuse of the house one greate
 sylver platter, xvij sylver porryngers, fyve sylver
 sawcers, one greate sylver spoone, And one sylver
 salte for Egges wth six tunnes & a salte att the toppe.

Plate Carryed awaie with his Lo^{ppc}
 this xijth of August 1605

Inprimis one Chased sylver basen with his Ewer
 Twoe paire of p[re?]-sente pottes chased
 Twoe paire of bottles chased thone of Snayle & thother
 of Scallop shell
 Twoe paire of greate Candlestickes chased
 ffyve Crocke Candlestickes.
 Twoe plaine sylver saltes thone bigger then thother
 One silver Jugge wth twoe eares

ffower playne sylver bolles of twoe sortes
 One single sugar boxe wth a smale spoone
 Three dossen of sylver spoones of w^{ch} one dossen are
 plaine and thother twoe Dossen crooked, thone wth the buckes
 ffoote in the knappes and thother wth ffaces or pictures
 of w^{ch} three are broken
 Three greate sylver plattes
 One dossen of sylver porringers
 Twoe smalle sylver sallett Dyshes
 Six sylver sawcers.

Brasse and pewter

Inprimis Twoe greate brasse pannes thone of them
 wth eares, Twoe great brasse [~~pottes~~] Crockes
 fyve lattyn pottes
 Three smalle brasse pottes
 one bell mettle frytter panne
 Twoe possnett Skyllettes
 Seaven brasse skyllettes, whereof 3: are newe.
 Six brasse bottles three of the bigger & 3 of the lesser
 ffyve brasse Skym[m]ers whereof 3. are greater than thother
 Twoe brasse ladells
 ffower fryeing pannes.
 Three Grydirons
 Tenne Yron spittes nd one paire of Yron Rackes
 One brasse Chaffer
 Three hanginges & one greate Yron barre vnmmoveable
 Three greate Yron dryppinge pannes, and an Yron
 to laie before the ffyer
 ffower payre of potthookes.
 One olde brasse Chaffendishe & twoe yron Chaffendishes
 wth handles.
 One great brasse mortar wth an Yron pestle
 One great Cleaving knife and twoe little ones.
 Three mynsinge knyves and twoe choppinge knives
 ffower greate plates for pasties whereofe twoe are olde
 Three myddle plates and three little plates.
 ffyve greate Chardgers whereof three somewhat olde
 Thirte and seaven greate platters
 ffower olde basens and Ywres
 Twoe olde Collanders
 Twoe Dossen and ffyve pottingers
 One Dossen and three myddle sawcers.
 ffyve olde little fruite Dyshes.
 One Dossen of plates. 3 olde platters & v. old pottingers
 One tostinge yron for apples.
 Two yron beefe prickers and an yron pile
 Three greate powdringe Tubbes.
 One musteed myll.

In the pantrye.

Six Candlestickes of Allcumye and 4: brasse candlestickes
whereof one is broken.

One Dossen and haulfe of new pewter Candlestickes

One other Dossen and haulfe of old pewter candlestickes
ffyve olde pewter saltes wthout Covers

Twoe pewter pottes.

Twoe greate blacke Jackes conteyninge 2: galons a peece

One other blacke Jacke of a gallen, and twoe small
blacke Jackes

Three Chyppinge Knives and twoe rapes

One case of knyves.

One coverynge baskett wth a voyder of leather painted

Twoe voydinge knyves.

One little square tabell boorde.

One greate Chyppinge trowe wth a Cubborde.

Lynnen in Clarencia her Chardge.

Inprimis xv paire of fyne holland sheetes little worne

Item vij payre of older holland sheetes, more worne

Item xvij paire of myddle holland sheetes whereof tenne
paire are ov[er] worne

Item 4: paire of myddle holland sheets little worne

Item ffyftie paire of lyv[er]ie sheetes not muche worne
and three paire of olde lyv[er]ie sheetes torne.

Item xj paire of ffyne holland pilloeties and xj paire
of midlen hollande pilloweties.

Item xij Damaske boorde Clothes (whereof) vj are
verie lardge and thother vj of a shorter sorte

Item xv^{teene} Damaske Cubberde Clothes

Item xj lardge Damaske Towells.

Item x Dossen of Damaske Table Naptkins and
eighte other lardge Damaske Naptkins

Item vij Dyaper Table Clothes (whereof) 4 are verie
lardge of the ffyneste Dyaper.

Item six ffyne Dyaper Cubbord Clothes
ffyve longe fyne Dyaper Towells and fower
shorter Dyaper Towells.

Item fyve dossen and a haulfe of ffyne Dyaper Napkins

Item : ix : lardge holland Tabell Clothes muche woorne
and fower other holland Tabell Clothese of a narrower
Breadethe

Item vij Course large Dyaper Table Clothes and : 3:
shorter Coorse Dyaper table Clothes.

Item vj Coorse Dyaper Cubbord Clothes.

Item vij Coorse Dyaper Towells

Item vij Dossen of Course Dyaper Tabell Napkins

Item : xvij : of the ffyne Canvas Cubberd Clothes

Tenne Dossen of the better Canvas napkins.
 Eighte Dossen of the Corser Canvas napkins.
 Twelve Dossen of the newer Canvas Napkins.
 Eleaven Canvas Towells.
 Eighte new lardge Canvas table Clothes for the halle
 whereof one is vsed in the Lawndrye.
 Tenne other olde Tabell Clothes for the halle ov[er?] woorne
 Three Trunckes, A Standarde and one greate cheste
 vsed for the Lynnen.
 One greate Crocke and a Lymbicke to make Aquavite

In the Stabell att Warder:

Inprimis, twoe newe Clothe Saddells of his Loppes wth
 their [~~scriptures~~] furnitures, thone covered wth redd Clothe
 and thother wth ashe Coloure and one other newe
 redd Clothe Saddell of his Lo^{ppe} in the Custodye of
 George Mullens of Shaston.

Item v: lyv[er]ie Saddells of clothe wth their furnitures
 Item one Saddell and a pyllen of my ladies wth a
 velvett saddle Clothe and other furniture for ye same
 Item one other Sadell and furniture of M^{rs} Elizabethe
 Arundells wth a Clothe of vellaume.
 Twoe pyllens for the gentlewomen wth their [~~furni~~]
 furnitures and an olde Clothe of ffustynapes.
 Item vij bytte brydells.
 Three Copper styroppes
 Item one other blacke padde Saddell of his Lo^{ppe}
 wth his furniture

In Anstye house.

Inprimis, In the Chamber att the Gallerye end One
 waynescott Bedsteede wth A Tester and one paire of Andirons

Item in the wardrobe one presse and a greate Cheste. In the
 Chamber wthout the wardrobe fower peeces of old Tapestrye
 hangeinge, one lyv[er]ie Cubberd, an olde Turkey Carpett and
 A Close Chayer of Strawe.

Item in the Chamber ov[er] the Buttery Chamber one waynescott
 Bedsteede, A Tester wth vallens & Curtens of greene saye,
 one olde ffeather bedde, A bolster A pyllowe, one paire of
 blankettes one greene and redd yarne Covered, an olde
 Chaire of haire Coloure wroughte velvett, one lyv[er]ie Cubberd,
 one little tabell Boorde, fower peeces of olde Tapestrye
 hangeinges, A lowe forme to stande att the bedds syde, one
 Carpett of Callicate and A paire of Andyrans.

- In the Chamber ov[er] the Buttery, one fframed table boord wth A
Leafe to rune ov[er], a ioyned forme and A presse.
- In the p[ar]lour Twoe tabell bordes, eighte Corn[er] stooles. 3: broken
Stooles one olde yellow velvett Chayre, one Crymson
velvett Chayre, one waynscott Cubberd, one Carpett and
Cubberd Clothe of greene Clothe frenged, one olde Cushen
wth A wolfe in the myddle, one other olde Cushen with
the picture of my Lord and Ladie, Nyne greate pictures
twentye little pictures, three little Mappes and fower
peesces of olde Tapestrye hangeinges.
- In the Chamber wth in the p[ar]lor one olde Bedsteede and lyv[er]jie
Cubberd and a broken paire of Andyrans.
- In my Lordes Chamber A Bedsteede haulfe guylded and twoe
old lyv[er]jie Cubberds.
- In the pantrye an olde Bynne and an olde square Tabell.
- In the Hawle twoe longe Boordes, one longe forme twoe ---
waynscott fformes and two lyv[er]jie Cubberds and in the
haulfe pace one square Table of wallnutte.
- In the olde p[ar]lor A lyv[er]jie bedsteede A ffeather bedd A bolster.
A paire of blankettes A white rugge one square Tabell twoe
shorte waynscott fformes one olde Cubberd and one payre
of Andyrans in Stephen Vanners Custodye
- In the Kitchin one paire of Rackes one greate Andyron and
A musted myll.
- In Roberte Brightes lodgeinge one lyv[er]jie Bedsteade A ffeather
Bedd A bolster A paire of blanckettes and a yarne coverled
of red and blewe.
- In the Stabell one lyv[er]jie Bedsteade, One ffeather bed A bolster
A paire of blanckettes and a redd yarne Coverled, And in the
Chamber att the Stable [~~illegible~~] ende one lyv[er]jie bedsteede A
ffeather bedd A bolster A paire of blanckettes an olde rugge
and one peece of Dornix.
- In the little Chamber ov[er] the Church one lyv[er]jie bedsteede.

In the Stable att Anstye

- Inprimis xj greate horse saddles whereof v. old wthout
styrops or other furniture.
Item 2 scottishe Saddles wth their furniture.
Item 6: Chaynes for horse noses

Item 4: Cannons.

Item 8: byttes and 7: watteryng bittes

Item one paire of horse spectacles, A Caveson.

Item vj hedstalles and raynes verye olde

Item iij Sacars muche worne.

Item vij horseclothes wth sursingles and haltars to eu[er]y
of them

Item: 3 plate Candlestickes to hange ov[er] the walles.

Three Currey Combes and 2: mane Combes.

Item tenne Dustinge Clothes verye muche woorne.

Seaven paire of pasterns.

Twoe pichforkes, one Colerake and twoe shovells.

Item one old sythe : 3 pailles : 2: Barrowes: 3 Seaves

One lyttle Table boorde.

A Drūme[?], 3 greate new ladders, one olde Ladder

Item one little cheste.

An Inventorie of all houshould
Stuffe att Salisbury house ~
taken this last of June, 1612.

Hangings of tapestry.¹

Given to my lord Clifford One Sute of fyne tapestree hanginges of the storye of Petrach
contayninge vj [~~yardes~~] peeces.
given to my lord Clifford one Sute of fyne tapestree hanginges of the storie of Julius Cekar---
contayninge vj peeces
one Sute of Tapestree hanginges of Imagery cont vj peeces of a---
Roman storye.
one other Sute of tapestrye hanginges of the storie of Haniball---
and Scipio cont vj peeces.
one sute of hanginges of fine tapestrie of the storie of Phaeton cont
3. peeces.
one Sute of tapestrie hanginges of the storie of Alexander cont---
5. peeces.
one Sute of Tapestrie hanginges of the storie of David cont---
8. peeces.
one Sute of Tapestrie hanginges of the storie of Elisha cont---
4 peeces.
all those nyne peeces ffive peeces of a Sute of nine of fyne large tapestrie of Antick
sould for 300^{li}. worke lyned all through wth Canvas, w^{ch} were bought of my Ladye
April 1616. Hunsdon and [6] 4 peeces att Hatfeild.

Hangings of a Courser sort of tap:

One Sute of tapestrie hanginges of the storie of Alexander Cont
8 peeces.
one Sute of tapestrie hanginges of fforest worke cont 8. peeces.
[at Hatfeild] one Sute of tapestrie hanginges of fforest worke cont 5. peeces.
one Sute of tapestrie hanginges of fforest worke wth some
Imagerie cont 6. peeces lind through wth Canvas.
one Sute of tapestrie hanginges of fforest worke cont. 6. peeces.
one Sute of tapestrie hanginges of fforest worke cont. 6. peeces.
one Single peece of [blot] tapestrie hanging fforest worke wth
some Imagery.
one other peece of ould Tapestrie hanginge fforest worke lined wth ---
Canvas.
one other litle peece more of Imagerye
one other litle ould peece of tapestry hanginges for a Chimney peece

¹ This inventory has the reference number Box C/40. There are 4 blank pages at the beginning and 58 at the end. There are three different hands: the original inventory taker (unknown), Christopher Keighley (whose annotations are shown here in italics) and another unknown later hand whose marginalia are shown in square brackets. As far as possible, original line lengths have been maintained; where this was impossible, there are increased indentations.

The letter “j” represents the long number one. All original crossings out are shown thus: [~~xxx~~].

Space fillers in the original in the middle of lines are indicated ~ and at the ends of lines are indicated ---
Marks made by the inventory taker at the ends of lines are indicated by the symbol /

or Windowe Cloth.✓

One other ould peece of Imagerie very ould.

One ould Sute of Course tapestrie of Imagerie cont 5. peeces.
 Two peeces more of an other sort of tapestrie hanginges ould.
 Two peeces more of another sorte of ould tapestrie forrest worke.
 Ould stuff Two more of another sorte of ould tapestrie hanginges one of them wth
 from Court. Armes in the midle.
 One other od peece more course tapestrie being shallowe.

Rich hanginges One Sute of greene velvett rychly imbrodred cont 6. peeces.
given to my One Sute of black velvett hanginges imbrodred wth Cloth of silver
Lord of Cont. 5. peeces
Somerset at One Sute of Chyna hanginges of Crimsen and watchett satten fynely
his marriage. painted and gilded Cont. 6. peeces and lyned wth Callico. /
 ffive peeces [æ] of Borders gilded and painted uppon Canvas sutable
 Six peeces of Cloth hanginges of stannell imbrodred wth pillers
 wth my Lo: Armes in the closett
 Two other litle peeces more sutable wth 3. Windowe Clothes of
 the same.

Nyne peeces of Italyan hanginges greene and painted wth borders
 and pillers.

Two false Loftes of Darnex in my ould Lo: bed Chamber and in the
 Corner Chamber next to my Lo: of Worcesters.
 Eight peeces of Darnix hanginges and a Curten of the same.
 One hanginge of Darnix and a longe Curten.
 Two other peeces of Darnix hanginges and one Curtaine of the same
 Two other peeces of Darnix hanginges.
 Three peeces more of Darnix hanginges.
 fflower peeces of greene kersey of bordringe imbrodred wth the
 wheat Sheaffe.
 Six peeces of gilt lether borders.
 Two peeces more[interlined] of gilt lether.

Carpetts. of Percia.

One fine longe percian Carpett fringed wth deep silke Crimsen---
 fringe 5. yarges qr longe. bredth 2. yarges qr.
 One longe percian Carpett 7. yarges longe 3. brode.
 One newe longe percian Carpett wth greene silke fringe 7. yarges
 longe di qr 3. yarges 3. qr broade
 One other longe percian Carpett 8. yarges longe 3. brode wth an
 orrenge cullor fringe.
 One other percian Carpett 7. yarges longe 3. brode wth watchett
 fringe ould worne.
 One other ~~longe~~ percian Carpett 4. yarges longe brode one. yarde
 3. qr yellowe fringe.
 One other longe Percian Carpett 4 yarges di' longe 2. yarges wanting
 di qr broade wth heare cullor fringe.
 j square broade percian Carpett of sadcullo^{rs} in length 2. yarges di, di
 qr broade 2. yarges di.
 j longe Course percian Carpett fringed wth a Crimson silke fringe.
 longe 3. yarges di, brode j yard qr
 j fine percian Carpett wrought wth gould and lyled wth Changeable
 taffete 2. ya: di longe j ya: 3. qr broade.
 j fine percian Carpett wrought wth silver and gould wth Crimsen
 fringe longe 2. y'di qr broade j. y'di. /
 j other fine percian Carpett wth a short yellowe fringe 2. y' qr
 longe broade j ya' di /
 j other square percian Carpett the ground white and the fringe.
 ij square percian Carpettes wth yellowe Cullor fringe.

Turkey Karpettes.

j lardge foote Carpett of Turkey worke longe 8 ya' di, 5 yarges
 broade di /
 j white foote Carpett of Turkey worke 4 ya' di longe broade
 2 yarges qr di'.
 j other of the same 3. ya: qr di longe j ya: 3 qr di.
 j other lardge foote Turkey Carpett longe 5 ya: di, broade 2. ya: di

ij square Turkey karpettes for Cubborddes the ground white.
 xvij square Turkey Carpettes for Cubborddes all of one size.
 ij other ould square Turkey Carpettes ould worne from the Courte
 j longe Carpett of Norw^{ch} worke lyned wth black buckrome longe
 4 ya: di broade 2. ya: qr di.
 j other square Carpett of Norw^{ch} worke longe 2 yardes 3. qr broade
 1 ya: 3. qr di /
 j thicke kneelinge Carpett of Turkey worke.

Nidle worke Carpettes.

j longe nidle worke Carpett unlyned wth a silke fringe longe 4
 ya: qr di broade 2. ya: qr di
 j other fine longe nidle worke Carpett for the Cubbord unfringed &
 unlined longe 3. ya: qr broade.
 j fyne nedle worke Carpett wrought wth silke and gould 2. ya: longe
 broade j ya: 3. qr lyned wth greene sarsnett. /
 j other fine nidle worke Carpett wrought wth silke gould & silver
 and lyned wth changeable taffete longe j yard 3. qr & j ya: qr broade
 ij fyne barbery Carpettes one^[interlined] lyned wth white Damaske
 thother unlyned longe 2. yardes qr di brode j ya: qr di /
 j other barbery Carpett lyned wth buckrome wth buttons.

j Carpett of greene velvett imbrodred wth silver and silver fringe ---
 lyned wth Carnacōn taffate.
 j litle Carpett of Crimson velvett imbrodred wth gould for a ---
 side table.
 j litle square Carpett of Crimson wrought velvett lyned wth
 Russett ffustian. /
 j Carpett of black velvett imbrodred like the hanginges of black
 velvett imbrodred
 j other square Carpett imbrodred wth slipps sutable to the
 Bedd. /

[lost at y^e christening
of my lady (illegible)]

j longe Carpett of blewe Damaske imbrodred wth Copper and
a border to it.

j litle ould square Carpett of blewe Damaske

j Callico Carpett painted and imbrodred wth Copp[er].

j square Carpett of fine wosted and Cruell.

j spanish lether Carpett styched and lyned wth Carnacōn ---
buckrome

j other round lether Carpett inlayed.

j longe Carpett of greene broad Cloth wth greene silke ---
fringe.

[Stolen out of the
draenge chamber
in the nether logenge
1616 19th July]

j other longe greene Carpett of broade Cloth wthout fringe
iij Carpettes and 3. Cubbord Clothes of greene Cloth unfringed

Wyndowe Cloth.

ij Windowe Clothes of black velvett imbrodred sutable to the black
velvett hanginges.

j Windowe Cloth of Crimsen satten imbrodred wth a border

j other of Crimsen wrought velvett lyned wth russett ---
ffustian✓

Windowe Curtaines.

ij Windowe Curtaines of black and white Changeable taffate
lyned wth black saye.

ij more of a shorter sorte sutable.

vij windowe Curtaines of Crimson and yellowe Damaske 2. lyned
wth Crimsen saye 3. wth yellowe saye 2. unlyned.

xvj wth watchett and Crimsen taffate for the gallery.

iiij [~~of wth~~] blewe white and greene taffate.

ij of greene and stroe cullor taffate.

ij of Changeable Taffate blewe and ashe Cullor

ij of Crimsen and yellowe taffate

ij of blewe and yellowe [taffate] Caffa.

iiij of mingled cullor blewe white & orrenge tawny [taffate] Caffa.

ij of Crimsen and white mingled [~~Taffate~~] Caffa
 ij of Cales stuff.
 iiij of greene kersey.
 viij of greene saye
 iiij more of a shorter size greene saye
 iij ould Curtaines of greene Cloth used att Courte.✓

ffeild Beddes.

Pavilian j. Pavilian of white taffite stained all over wth divers Cullo^{rs} and lyned wth white Callico.
 j Bedsteed red and gilded belonginge to it.
 j Gilt Bedsteed the testar vallance and Curtains of black velvett --- imbrodred wth sleave silke of nidle worke in divers Cullors and lyned wth changeable Taffete wth 8 plumes of ffethers.
 j Counterpoint of black velvett sutable to the same bed.
 j feild Bedsteed the testerne vallance and Curtaines of Crimson velvett trimed wth silver lace and silke and silver fringe.
 j Counterpoint of Crimsen taffete imbrodred wth silver [~~twix~~] twist -- sutable.
 j Bedsteed of Chyna worke black and gilded the tope vallance and Curtaines of white Callico wrought all over wth needle worke wth 8 plumes of ffethers, orrenge Tawny and white.
 j lardge Counter pointe of the same sutable.
 j slope Bedsteed the vallance and Curtaines of stained Chamlett
 j Counter pointe of stained taffate sarsnett sutable to the Bed.
 j slope Bedsteed of wallnutt tree the topp the vallance & Curtaines of greene Damaske lyned wth greene saye.
 j Counter point of greene taffete sutable.
 v inner Curtaines of greene Cloth for the same.
 j Bedsteed of wallnutt tree the topp vallance and Curtaines of stannell Cloth.
 j Counter pointe of the same Cloth trimed wth silke and silver lace.
 j Bedsteed of wallnutt tree the topp vallance and Curtaines of Cales stuffe.
 j Counter pointe of the same.
 j smale slope Bedsteed the testerne vallance and Curtaines of blewe Caffa.

j Bedsteed of wallnuttree the tester vallance and hed of yellowe Cloth
 of silver the Curtaines of yellowe taffite.
 j Counterpointe or turkie quilt of yellowe taffite.

Canopies.

j Cannapie of Crimsen velvett the traine of Crimsen ---
 taffite trimed wth lace and silke and silver fringe.
 j Counter pointe of Crimsen taffite imbrodred wth twist
 j Cannapie of fugred satten the traines of Changeable ---
 taffite.
 j Cannopee of white and Crimsen Caffa ~ ~ wth a traine
 of the same.

[j at Hatfeld] iij. Cannopies and the traines of Darnix.
 j other Cannapie and the traines of greene saye.

Cooches.

j Cooch Bedsteed of mother of pearle.
 j fyne woll bedd quilted and a boulster to it.
 j Counterpointe of white Chyna grograine imbrodred all over
 wth sleeves silke and gould in divers cullors belonginge to ---
 the Cooch.
 j blewe Cooch Bedsteed.
 j woll Bedd and boulster unto it covered wth blewe Damaske
 j vallance of the same to goe about the bedsteed.

Single Counter pointes not sutable
to Beddes.

- j Chyna Counter pointe of red velvett imbrodred wth gould and lyned wth watchett taffite.
- j ritch Chyna Counterpointe of white Damaske wrought uppon wth silver and gould and lyned wth changeable Taffete.
- j ritch Chyna Counterpointe imbrodred uppon greene velvett wth sleeves silke silver and gould unlyned.
- j Counterpointe or faire Chyna Quilt of Callico wrought all over wth yellowe silke of needle worke, and lyned wth yellowe taffete.
- j white Chyna Counter pointe of callico stitched all over wth yellowe silke and fringed wth yellowe fringe.
- j Counter pointe of white Callico stitched & wrought all over with stroe Cullor silke of nidle worke and lyned wth callico of stro cullor.
- ij other Counter pointe, of white callico stitched wth white --- threed, j larger then thother.

Skrines wth fframes.

- j skrine of black velvett imbrodred sutable to the black velvett Bedd
- j skrine of imbrodred Chyna grograine sutable to the Counter pointe wrought wth sleeves silke and gould and lyned wth white fustian and fringed wth Changeable silke.
- j skrene of Carnacōn Copp[er] Caffa.
- j skrine of stript Copp[er] Caffa.
- j litle skrine Cloth of crimson duraunce
- j skrine of white Cales stuff.
- j other skrine of orrenge Cullor Cales stuff ould.
- ij skrines of green Buckrome.
- j lardge fouldinge skrine to p[ar]te a roome of greene Cloth.
- j other of greene Cotton.
- ijj. wicker skrines and one ould tufted . /

Chaires Stooles and Quishions.

j broade Chaire	}	
ij highe stooles.	}	of Ash Cullor Cloth of gould.
j lowe stoole	}	
j longe quishion	}	
j lowe broade Chaire or seate of Crimsen Cloth of silver.		
j lowe Chaire	}	
ij highe stooles	}	
ij lowe stooles	}	all of crimsen & yellowe cloth of silver.
v longe quishions	}	
j highe Chaire	}	
ij highe stooles	}	
j lowe back Chaire	}	of greene velvett ritchly imbrodred w th
j foote stoole.	}	the frames gilded.
iiij longe quishions	}	
j highe back Chaire	}	
ij back Chaires	}	
ij highe stooles.	}	of Orrenge tawny velvett imbrodred w th
j foote stoole.	}	silver the frames gilded.
j longe quishion	}	
ij highe Chaires	}	
j lowe Chaire	}	
ij lowe stooles	}	of black velvett imbrodred w th slipps the frames
j foote stoole	}	of div[er]s sortes gilded.
iiij longe quishions	}	
j highe back Chaire.	}	
j lowe back Chaire.	}	of Crimsen velvett imbrodred w th chyna ---
ij longe quishions	}	gould the frames redd & gilded.
j highe stoole.	}	of crimsen velvett imbrodred w th yellowe satten---
j lowe stoole	}	ould.
j highe back Chaire.	}	
ij highe stooles.	}	of greene stript velvett w th Gould & fringe.
j longe quishion.	}	
j back Chaire	}	

j highe Chaire	}	of crimsen velvett trimed w th crimsen silke fringe
ij highe stooles.	}	
j highe Chaire	}	
j lowe Chaire.	}	
j highe stoole.	}	of crimsen velvett trimed w th Crimsen
ij lowe stooles.	}	silke and silver fringe.
j foote stoole	}	
j longe quishion	}	
j highe Chaire	}	
j lowe Chaire	}	
j highe stoole.	}	all of murry velvett trimed w th silke & gould.
ij lowe stooles.	}	
j foote stoole	}	
iiij longe quishions	}	
j square quishion	}	
j highe Chaire.	}	
ij highe stooles	}	of tawney velvett trimed w th tawny ---
j longe quishion	}	silke fringe.
j highe Chaire.	}	
xiiij highe back Cha:	}	of black velvett trimed w th black silke fringe
ij square quishions	}	
j lowe fouldinge Cha:	}	
j lowe back Cha:	}	
ij highe stooles.	}	of ould purple velvett.
iiij lowe stooles	}	
j highe Chaire	}	
iiij ould stooles of black velvett		
j highe Chaire	}	of black uncutt velvett.✓
ij back Chaires.	}	
j highe Chaire.	}	
vj stooles.	}	of black wrought velvett.✓
j litle square quishion	}	

j highe Chaire.	}	
j highe stoole.	}	of ould crimsen wrought velvett.
j lowe stoole	}	
j highe stoole.	}	
ij lowe stooles	}	of ould popingey greene wrought velvett
j highe Chaire	}	of satten ritchly imbrodred w th Imagery w th the late
j longe quishion	}	Queenes picture in the back of the Chaire.
ij highe back Cha:	}	
j lowe back Cha:	}	made of a ritch Coape wrought w th Imagery.
ij highe stooles	}	
ij other longe quushions the ground silver Chamlett ritchly ~		
imbrodred w th gould and silke of divers Cullo: ^{rs}		
j highe Cha:	}	
ij highe stooles	}	of whit Chyna Grograine imbrodred w th sleave silke
ij lowe stooles.	}	& gould.
ij longe Quushions of white satten imbrodred to sute w th it.		
j highe Chaire	}	
j highe stoole.	}	of orrenge Cullor and white tuft taffite
j lowe stoole.	}	
j longe quishion	}	
ij highe Chaires of sea greene and white tuft taffite.		
vj highe stooles of black tuft taffite.		
j highe Chaire	}	
vj highe stooles	}	of black and green fugred satten.
j longe quishion	}	
j highe Chaire	}	
j lowe Chaire	}	
ij backe Chaires	}	of watched wrought Damaske w th gould.
iiij highe stooles	}	
ij lowe stooles	}	
iiij longe quishions	}	

j highe Chaire.	}	
vij highe stooles	}	of Crimsen Damaske.
ij lowe stooles.	}	

j highe Chaire	}	
vij highe stooles	}	of blewe and olliffe cullor damaske.
ij lowe stooles.	}	

j broad lowe Chaire w th wings or seate for longe quishions.	}	
j highe Chaire	}	
j highe black Chaire	}	
ix highe stooles.	}	of purple & greene mingled Damaske.
ij longe quishions	}	
ij square quishions.	}	

j highe Cha:	}	
ij back Cha:	}	
ij highe stooles	}	of callico wrought w th nidle worke
ij lowe stooles	}	sutable to the Bed of Callico.✓
j foote stoole	}	

j highe Chaire	}	
ij highe back Cha:	}	
ij lowe back Cha:	}	
ij highe stooles	}	All of nidle worke Irish stitch the [blank]
iiij longe quishions	}	
ij square Quishions	}	

Quushions.

j lardge nidle worke quushion lyned w th yellowe satten
j longe needle worke quishion lyned w th lether.
j longe nidle worke quushion lyned w th yellowe satten.
j longe nedle worke quushion lyned w th greene satten of bridges.
j square nedle worke Q: lyned w th popinge greene.
j longe nedle worke Q: lyned w th purple spanish lether.
j litle square Q: needle worke Crimsen and silver lyned w th ---
Crimsen taffite.
j litle square nedle worke Q: lyned w th ould white tuft taffite.

j other ould square nidle worke quishion lyned wth spanish lether.
 j Broad Bed or Q: for a Caroach of greene velvett.
 j longe quishion of russett satten imbrodred wth slips and lyned
 wth russet taffite.
 j longe quishion of peach cullor and crimsen damaske the one side
 of Cloth of silver.
 j longe Q: unmade up of white Cloth of silver imbrodred wth
 wreathes & beastes in them.
 ij longe Q: of ritch Chyna satten ritchly imbrodred wth gould ---
 and silver unmade up lyned wth in wth Crimsen taffite.
 ij longe Q: of white taffite ritchly imbrodred wth gould & silke
 & lyned wth Changeable taffite unmade up.
 ij litle pillowes sutable of the same.
 iij newe Q: of Tapestry unmade up.

ij highe Chaires	}	
ij highe back Cha:	}	of yellowe brokedell
xxix stooles	}	
ij longe quushions	}	
j highe Cha:	}	of stamell cloth trimed w th silke & silver
ij highe stooles	}	lace.
j highe Chaire	}	
ij highe stooles	}	of greene Cloth.
j litle lowe Cha:	}	
ij highe back Cha:	}	
iiij highe stooles.	}	of thrombd worke.
ij highe back Cha:	}	
iiij highe stooles.	}	of redd lether.
j highe Chaire	}	
ij highe back Cha:	}	of black lether ould.
v highe stooles	}	
v fouldinge stooles of black lether used att Courte.		
j redd one more fouldinge.		

fframes for Chaires unmade up.

j highe Chaire	}	
ij back Chaires	}	black & gilded.

ij litle back Cha:	}	
ij stooles.	}	gilded.

j Chaire of red stamell wth a Cannopie trimed wth greene fringe.
 j other tower of the same made for my Lord in his sicknes wth a
 broad footestoole and pillowe.

j other of watched Cloth trimed wth silver lace and fringe.

j faire newe greene Chaire goinge uppon wheles.

Picktures.

ij greate Pictures of Adam and Eve, j wth a Curtaine.

j great picture of the gatheringe of all the Creatures into Noies
 Arke.

j other great picture of Noies ffludd.

j picture of Abraham and Isack.

j picture of Moyses and the Bushe Burninge

j lardge picture of some certaine storie of Scripture.

j night picture of Christ prayinge.

j picture of Italian Cookerey.

j picture of S^t Paule in a Traunce.

j picture of S^t Peter and the Cock Crowinge

j litle picture of the bearth of Christ in a frame

j other litle picture of Christ & the virgine Marie.

j other picture of Christ & litle Children cominge to him.

A picture of the betrayinge of Christ by night.

A picture of Marie Magdalen.

A greate picture of Christ and the virgin Marye.

A prospective picture of a Cathedrall Church.
 A picture of Lawra.
 A picture of a percian Queene in a Table of brasse.
 A picture of Pallas.
 A picture of venus and Cupid
 A lardge picture of Jupiter & danae in a showre of gould
 A picture of Jupiter & Leda.
 A picture of Diana.
 A picture of pan and Appollo.
 twoe pictures of Mercurie Argus & Io.
 A picture of time.
 A picture of Nynus semerimys.
 A picture of a batle by night.
 twoe pictures of land skipps the frames gilded one of Sea the
 other by land.
 A picture of a Table furnished wth victualls.
 j other dutch picture of a breackfast
 j other dutch picture of a markett of fishe
 j picture of the prodigall.
 j picture of Henry the 7. and Henr the 8. wth a curtaine of ---
 purple taffite fringed wth gould.
 j picture of the Lord Darnley and his brother Charles wth a curtaine
 of purple [j] taffite fringed wth gould
 j picture of the Queene. Mother of Scotland.
 j faire picture of the late Queene Eliz':
 j picture of his Ma.^{tie}
 j picture of the Queene Anne.
 ij smale pictures of the queene mother
 j [ix] picture[s] of the land grave of hes
 j picture of Henry the Arch duke.
 j picture of the Infanta.
 j picture of the prince of Parma.
 j picture of the Kinge of ffrance He. the 3.
 j picture of the kinge of ffraunce He: the 4.
 j picture of the Duke of Guis.
 j picture of the Queene mother
 j picture of S^r Nicholas Bacon Lo: keep[er]
 j picture of the Earle of Leicester.

j picture of the Lord Burgley Lo: Treasurer.
 j other litle picture of the Lo: Burgley Lo: Treasurer
 j other picture of the La: Burgley.
 j other of the Countis of Oxford.
 j other picture of my Lo: Treasurer yo^r Lo:^{ps} ffather.
 j picture of my Ladye yo^r Lo:^{ps} mother.
 j picture of my ould Lo: Treasurer his mother.
 j picture of the Lord Carew wth a Curtaine.
 j picture of S^r walter Raughlie.
 j picture of ould S^r Anthony Cooke.
 j picture of Alablaster.
 j picture of a Swishbatle.
 j picture of the habitt of the Chynaes
 j figure of Christ
 j figure of a woman in wax.
 j picture of ould powell.
 j picture of garragantuas head.

Mapps /

j Mappe of England in a fframe.
 j other Mapp of Europe in a fframe.
 j other Mapp of the habitt of all Cuntries.
 j other Mapp of Germaney and the nether landes.
 iij other ould litle Mapps in fframes.

j Pedigree of all the Princes of England in a fframe of
 wallnutt tree inlayed.

Instruments.

j ffaire greate wynd Instrument the Case of wallnuttree ---
 curiously inlayed.
 j greate Organ in a Case of wainscott
 j greate harpesicall wynd Instrum^t wth virginall in it, in a
 Case of wood painted.
 j litle Organ in a Case of wainscott wth a frame to ---
 stand uppon.
 j greate harpesicall virginall the keys of mother of pearle
 in a case of wood painted red wth ij pillar tressells.
 j litle paire of virginalls covered wth crimsen [~~velv~~] Cloth
 of gould.✓

Tables.

j Table of mother of Pearle inlaid wth a Chest bord of ---
 mother of Pearle sutable.
 j fouldinge Table of Chyna black and guilded wth a frame
 to stand uppon.
 j square Chyna Table black and gilded wth a Pellican on it
 standinge on a frame.
 j other Chyna Table wth a frame black & gilded.
 j litle side Chyna Table standing uppon a pillar frame wth
 drawinge Boxes.
 j litle fouldinge Table of Ibonie ✓
 j square Table of Ibonie inlaid wth Ivory uppon a pillar
 frame.✓

j faire Table of white marble inlaid wth divers sortes of stones uppon a frame of wood painted.

j Ovall table of white marble sett in Ibonie upon a frame of Alagozant

j square Table of red marble artificially made uppon a frame of wood painted red & yellowe.

ij litle stone Tables of grey marble uppon pillers of stone in the stone gallery in the gardein.✓

ij red or peach Cullor marble Tables the one square the other wth --- around wrought in squares wthout frames.

ij pillers of a Beifer ~ cullor marble & ij greate round Bales uppon the same.✓

j Billiard Table covered wth grene velvett.✓

Tables of wallnutt tree.

ij longe drawinge Tables of wallnuttree wth frames.

j litle drawinge Table of wallnuttree.

j square Table of wallnuttree inlaid uppon a fframe.

j broad square Table of wallnuttree wth a fouldinge frame.

vj square fouldinge Tables of wallnuttree wth fouldinge frames.

j Table inlaid wth a frame to it.

iiij formes of wallnuttree

iiij lowe stooles of wallnuttree inlayed.

iiij highe stooles plaine.✓

Wainscott Tables.

iiij greate Drawinge Tables of wainscott wth frames.

ij lesser drawinge Tables of wainscott wth frames.

viiij square fouldinge Tables of wainscott wth fouldinge frames.

j litle fouldinge Table and frame painted blewe.

j longe Table of deale wth a frame.

[iiij longe Elme Tables wth Tressells.

In the Hall. [vj formes

[j side Table and frame of wainscott.✓

Court Cubbordes of wallnuttree

j black and gilded.
 vj Court Cubbordes of wallnuttree of Div[er]s sizes.
 j other Cubbord wallnuttree wth locke & key.

Court Cubbordes. of wainscott

vij Court Cubbordes of wainscott of Dyvers sizes
 wainscott stooles.

Cabennettes.

j faire great Cabbennett cover wth black velvett & bound ---
 about wth plate gilte wth iiij gilt lockes standinge uppon a---
 frame black and gilte wth drawers.
 j Cabennett or litle Chest of Chyna worke black and gilte.
 j faire Cabbennett of Ibonye trimed both wthin & wthout wth
 silver plate beinge the topp of an Instrument given to the Kinge.
 j longe Cabennett of Ibonie inlaid wth Bone ingraven ---
 wth Imagery.
 j litle longe plaine Cabennett of Ibonye wth div[er]s lockes.
 j litle plaine Caskett of Ibonye.
 j litle plaine Cabennett of Ibonye inlaid wth Ivorye
 j other litle Cabennett of Ibonye wrought wth mother of ---
 pearle and greene fflees.
 j litle standish of Ibonye wth sissers & [pee] penn knives in the same
 j Cabennett of Ibonye and Ivorye carvet wth Imagery
 j Caskett or Box gilt and painted in divers Cullors wth a
 Case of Caffa.
 j Cabbennett of Chyna gilt all over.
 j other square Cabennett of Chyna gilt & painted.

j litle flatt Chyna box gilt and painted.
 j nest of litle boxes of Chyna.
 j Box of Cornacōn velvett bound wth gould lace the Cover
 ritchly wrought wth needle worke of gould silver silke & peare.
 j box of Ibonie and nidle worke the lock key and hinges of ---
 silver and lined wthin wth Crimsen velvett.
 j litle Jewell box of Ibonie wth drawers wth gould waighes
 and sayes for pearle wthin the same.
 j longe standish inlaid wth tortus shells [œf] and mother of pearle
 j litle ould box or seller for botles cover wth orrenge tawny velvett wth
 a lookinge glasse in it
 j Cabennett or Jewell Chest of Crimsen velvett in a Case of lether
 bound wth Iron.
 j other litle Cabennett inlaid in a case of wainscott.
 j greate Danske Cabennett inlayd
 j other inlaid used for pap[er]s.
 j other lesser inlaid.
 j other greate highe danske Cabennett inlaid.
 j Caskett covered wth purple velvett ritchly imbrodred wth gould
 and pearle wth a standish in it.
 ij other litle Cabennettes or Caskettes inlaid wth mother of pearle.
 j other Caskett of Crimsen velvett bound about wth gould lace.
 ix boxes of red and black gilt lether used wth papers.
 j Caskett of red spanish lether.
 j litle red lether Caskett bound wth Irone.
 j other ould black lether Caskett.
 j other of Oliffe Cullor
 ij litle ones black & yellowe lether.
 j ould Cabennett or Chist of black lether wth a false bottome
 in it.✓

A note of divers thinges w^{ch} were in the Cabennett

- j Turkie Basen & Ewer of lether painted and gilte.
- j Basen and Ewer of Borskin the Ewer bound wth silver.
- j flatt Boule or purslin dishe gilt
- j litle round deepe^[interlined] purslin dish gilt.
- iiij other litle round deepe purslin dishes gilte of a lesser size.
- j Castinge botle for sweete water of silver sett wth dyamons and other precious stones.
- A picture of S^t John Baptist Head of Agett bound wth silver.
- A forke of Cristall bound wth silver and get and sett wth smale stones.
- x smale spoones of mother of pearle.
- j other smale castinge botle of silver get and sett wth divers --- pr[e]cious stones
- j litle Celestiall Speare ~ wth in a litle globe of silver gett
- iiij litle silver hookes or taches.
- j plaine round stone of agett
- j other of a lesser sorte
- ij knyves haftes of agett
- j litle flatt stone of allotropie in the forme of a harte.
- j litle fugure or picture of blewe stone.
- j litle salte of Christall bound wth silver and gilt in a Case of Carnacōn taffite.
- iiij litle Cupps or dishes of Christall of divers sortes --- spotted & painted wth divers Cullers.✓
- ij litle dishes of Chyna painted and gilte the inner side of [Θ] Occamyne.
- j hower glasse of Ibonye brocken.
- ij litle square voyders of Chyna.
- ij flatt round dishes of Chyna for fruite painted in div[er]s Cullors.

- j greate deepe wicker Chyna Boule.
- iiij flatt fruite dishes of wicker Chyna.✓

xxv flatt fruite Dishes of a lesser size of divers sortes of Chyna
 painted and gilte. /
 ij litle round deepe Chyna dishes painted red & guilte. /
 ij other litle deepe dishes of wicker Chyna /
 xj litle wicker Chyna dishes of a midle sorte.
 vj other litle wicker Cupps or Boules of Chyna.
 xv litle wicker dishes or Cupps of the lesser size.
 j round box of Chyna black and gilte wth a false bottome ---
 wth in red & guilt. /
 j other flatt square Box of Chyna wth a false bottome in it.
 j litle hand skryne of Damaske.
 j nidle worke purse of silke & silver.
 j greene lookinge glasse bound about wth silver & gilte.
 j Combe of a fyne Cullored horne.
 j earthen Jugg wth a Cover. /

Deskes. j. Deske of greene velvett trimed wth gould & greene silke
 fringe /
 j deske of black velvett. /

Playing Tables & Chest bordes.

j Chest bord of Ibonie inlayed wth silver wth burdes and
 beastes of div[er]s sortes /
 j faire payre of Tables rytchly inlayed wth mother of pearle
 in divers Cullors wth Imagerye.
 j other of Ibonie inlayed wth Ivorie wth table men of the same
 j other of Ibonie rytchly inlayed wth mother of pearle wth
 the K: Armes in them. /

Lookinge Glasses. /

j faire greate venetian lookinge glasse wth pillers of ---
 marble and the Cover of agett.
 j ould lookinge glasse in a fframe of mother of pearle.
 j lookinge glasse of steele in a frame of Ibonie /
 j lardge lookinge glasse covered wth purple velvett.

Andirons.

j fayre greate payre of Copp[er] Andirons in the greate Chamber
 j other faire greate payre in the wthdrawinge Chamber
 j other pa: in the Cabennett Chamb[er].
 j other litle pa: in the Corner Chamb[er] next to my Lo: of
 worcesters above.
 j great pa: in the gallery.
 j pa: more in the wthdrawinge Chamb[er] to the gallery.
 j pa: in the Closett of a midle sorte.
 j pa: in the litle wthdrawinge Chamb[er] ov[er] the Porters lodge.
 j litle pa: in my Lo: bedd Chamb[er].
 j pa: in the newe lodgings in my Lo. Clyffordes Chamb[er].
 j pa: in the sutors Chamb[er].
 j pa: in the booke Chamb[er].
 j pa: in the Corner Chamb[er] next to it.

j fyer shovell }
 ij pa: of tonges } of Copp[er].

ix pa: of Iron Andirons wth brasse topps.
 iiij greate scoup fyre shovells.
 xij pa: of Touniges.
 iiij litle fire shovells.
 iiij plaine paire of Iron Andirons.
 j greate fyer forke.
 ij pa: of bellowses.
 j Lanterne of Brasse
 ij litle branch Candlestickes of brasse.
 ij Buckes heades wth brancht Candlestickes of brasse.
 iiij plate Candlestickes of brasse
 ij Grates for Sea Cole.✓

In a black lether Standard or Chest

j whole peece of Carnacōn Cloth of tyshue.
 j other peece of black and tawnye velvett on both sides cont ---
 xj yardes.
 Certaine litle remnantes of stained taffete
 j smale. peece of stript Callico 8. yardes.
 ix payre of Sables.
 j bundell of [~~white~~] white rawe silke untwisted.
 A p[ar]cell of watched silke
 A nett of greene silke to Cast over a Canopie.
 iiij Spanish lether skynns.
 ij Chyna Skarffes.
 j barbynge shert or mantle of Chyna Callico styched.
 j litle square night gere bagge of blewe wrought velvett.
 ij other bagges of white and Crimsen stoole worke.

In a litle black Truncke.

j shorte Cloake of tawny velvett wth sleeves and Capp ---
 all imbrodred [~~rit~~] ritchly wth pearle.
 j foote Cloth of tawny velvett ritchly imbrodred wth ---
 pearle sutable to the Cloake.
 It[e]m headstall and Raines wth petrall & docke wth sturrupp
 lethers and other peeces sutable imbrodred.
 xix paines of the same cullor velvett imbrodred for one
 paire of hose.

In the dansk Chest where the Child bed lynnen was.

j faire sweete bagge imbrodred wth cullored silke and silver uppon
 white grograine & lyned wth carnacōn taffite.
 ij faire quushonettes imbrodred wth gould & silver.
 j faire longe quushon imbrodred wth slipps of cullored ---
 silke and gould fringed wth the like Cullored silke and gould
 and iiij greate tassels lynned wth greene satten and a
 p[ar]chment lace of gould.
 j square nedle worke Carpett wrought wth slipps in
 cullo^{rs} fringed wth cullored silkes and lyned wth yellowe taffite.
 ij trenchers of gould lace the one ritchly purld and the
 other Bound lace.✓

Robes. /

j Parliament robe of scarlett Cloth wth sword belt and all
 other thinges thereto belonginge.
 j Parliament robe of Crimsen velvett wth a gilt sword and
 belt wth all other thinges thereto belonginge.
 j other Robe of purple velvett wth a ritch gilt sword and all
 thinges thereto belonginge being the gartter robe.
 The Robes when yo^r Lo:^p was made knight of the bath.
 A foote Cloth of tawney velvett ritchly imbrodred wth ---
 tawney silke and Gould wth head stales and raines. /
 ij Chyna mantles wrought uppon Callico wth stroe
 cullor silke.
 j other mantle of greene velvett lyned wth shagge.
 j white silke hatt.

Divers Particuler thinges remayninge in the
wardrop.

j faire Iron Chest
 ij ould black lether standardes wthout lockes.
 j lardge Chyna Chest or standard.
 iij wainscott presses.
 xiiij Italian modells of white marble wth other piramides
 of porfery & peeces of white marble.
 A modell of a rocke in a Case.
 ij french Pistolls j inlaid wth mother of pearle the
 other plaine.
 j muskett
 j pollaxe wth a rapier blade in it and covered wth ---
 greene velvett /
 j picture of white marble of Aristotle.
 j lardge Standard covered wth lether.
 yo^r Lo:^{ps} Russett Armor lyned wth crimsen satten and gilt
 stooedes.

j ould Chyna Targett.
j deale Chest for vyolls.✓

Beddinge.

of Downe. ij downe Bedds & boulsters wth stript tickes.
ijj other Downe Beddes and boulsters wth ordinary tyckes.
vij paire of Downe pillowes of divers sortes

iiij greate lardge ffether Beddes and boulsters of the best sorte
ijj fflock pillowes of white fustian.
x livery Bedds and boulsters w^{ch} came from Courte.
xlvij livery Beddes and boulsters more for servantes.
ijj fflock Beddes.
xij fyne wolle Beddes or mattres of hollandes quilted
j Cradle Bedd of fustian
xxix Course Canvas mattres.
j of yellowe fustian
Rough Mattes, sedge Mattes and plaine mattes in all – xxx.
Livery Bedd steeds & Canopie bed steedes of div[er]s sortes in all –
xxxij
Settle Bedd steedes – ij.

j Northampton sheire Rugge sett uppon Canvas in divers ---
Cullo^{rs}.✓

	ij white	}	
	ij greene	}	
	iiij redd.	}	
Rugges of the best	ij yellowe	}	xij
sorte.	j Tawney	}	
	j watchett	}	
	j orrenge Tawney	}	

	xix greene	}	
	ij blewe	}	
	ix Checkard	}	
	vij redd.	}	
Rugges of the Courser	ij orrenge Tawny	}	xliij.
sorte.	j Carnacōn.	}	
	j yellowe	}	
	ij white.	}	

j large paire of duple fustian Blanckettes.
 iiij paire of fustian blanckettes & j odd.
 j payre of doble wollen blanckettes.
 l. pa: of single blanckettes of divers sortes of wollen.
 ix Course Coverlettes Country.
 j Course Coverlett of ould tapestrie unlyned.
 j Coverlett of verdure.

xiiij Tables & frames of deale and wainscott used in sundry
 places in the house.
 j round Table of wainscott.
 ij ould fouldinge tables & frames.
 iiij Tables wth tressells.✓

Close Stooles Pannes & Chamb[er] pottes.

j Close stoole and panne covered wth counterfeite Cloth of silver.
 j other Close stoole and panne covered wth Crimsen velvett and
 imbrodred wth Gould wth E:R.
 j ould Close stoole of black velvett wthout a panne.
 viij Close stooles and pannes covered wth lether.
 iiij newe pannes.
 5 Bedd pannes covered wth greene Cotton.
 iiij Chamb[er] pottes.✓.

In the Landery.

j greate Caldron wth ij Ringes to it.
 j greate Trevett.
 j brasse washinge panne.
 j other ould brasse pann of the same bignes.
 j fier shovell.
 j Chafer of Copper.
 j fire forke of Iron.
 j smothinge table and tressells.
 j drayner to hange wash Clothes on.
 j lardge washinge Boule.
 ij washinge beetles.
 j buckinge stoole
 ij pailles wth Iron handles.
 ij halfe Tubbes to rince Clothes in .
 j dresser bord.
 ij washinge bordes.

In the Laundres Chamber

j litle ioynе worke table, ij shelves j lowe forme.
 j ioynе worke Cubbard of firr.
 ij ladders and a cover for a Windowe.

In the Pantery.

ij Pewter Cesternes wth handles
 iij Table Baskettes
 vij pewter saltes
 xxij pewter Candlestickes
 j Cubbard wth ij particions
 j other lettice Cubbard.
 j Table wth ij tressells ij shelves.
 j longe table ioynd to the wall & a longe forme ioynd to the wall.
 j Candle box ij Iron hooches fastened to the wall to hange towells on.

A note of the Pewter.

iiij of the first sorte.
 xxij of the second sorte.
 xxix of the third sorte
 xlvj of the 4th sorte.
 xxxj of the 5th sorte
 xxiiij of the 6th sorte.
 xiiij of the vijth sorte
 vij of the 8th sorte.
 ix of the 9th sorte.
 xx of the xth sorte.
 xlvj Sawcers
 iiij pie Plates of all sortes.
 iij payre of greate Rackes.
 iiij Broches
 ij Pottes of the first sorte
 j Pott of the second sorte
 iij pottes of the third sorte.
 iiij ould ones past use
 j Copper kittle.
 ij Copper pannes.
 j litle brasse furnace.
 iiij Brasse Kettles.
 v. brasse panns.
 ij ould Skellettes.

j Brasse mortar and Iron pestle.
 ij brasse Skymmers.
 j brasse Ladle.
 j brasse Cullander.
 j pewter Cullander.
 ij mincinge knives.
 ij Clevers.
 j Choppinge kniffe.
 iiij Iron drippinge panns.
 j beefe forke.
 j Grediron
 iiij fryinge panns.
 ij Trevettes.
 ij ould fier shovells.
 ij settinge peeles
 ij hand peeles
 ij Stone morters.
 ij wodden Pestles.
 iiij Powdringe Tubbes
 viij fflaskettes.
 ij Pailes.
 xj Trayses.
 j Trugge.
 ij Barrs of Iron to hold up the ffier
 j pa: of waites and scales.
 ffive halfe hundredes of Leade.
 ij quarternes & ij smale waites.
 j Bredgrate.

ffor the Hall.

j Iron grate
 ij fier shovells.
 j forke.
 j Covell.

Dyap[er] Lynnen.

- Dyaper. [iiij longe Table Clothes of Dyap[er] whereof 3. of 6. yardes & j of 8. yardes longe.
 [iiij other of ~~illegible~~ 4 yardes longe a peece
 [xx. table Clothes of 3. ya: a peece.
 [ix Table Clothes of fyne dyap[er] of 4. yardes.
 [j Table Cloth of Dyap[er] fine of 5. ya:
 [ij fine table Clothes of 3. ya: di'.
 [j Cubbord Cloth of the same sorte of dyap[er] of 2. yardes di'.
 In the Careck Chest. [ij other Table Clothes of fyne Dyap[er] j [interlined] of 4 ya: and thother of 5. ya:
 [iiij Table Clothes of other dyap[er] of 3. ya:
 [xxj Cubbord Clothes of 2. ya: ~~illegible~~ di' a peece.
 [viiij more of 2. ya: di' a peece.
 [xv Cubbord Clothes of 2. ya: qr a peece.
 [iiij course dyap[er] towells of 3. ya:
 [xiiij fyner dyap[er] Towells of diverse lengthes.
- Damaske. j longe Table Cloth of R: C:
 ij newe table Clothes of 8 ya. of E: C:
 iiij other table Clothes of 5. ya: or thereabouts. one of R: S: & 2 of R: C:
 vj table Clothes of 4. ya: of E: C:
 j Cutt for my ould Lo: use. vj Towells of 6. ya: a peece or thereaboutes of [blot] E: C:
 v. dozen and 7. fyne damaske napkins of E C.
- Dyap[er]. ij Table Clothes one[interlined] of 9. ya: & one of 4. ya:
 iiij dozen & 3. of fine diap[er] napkins.
 xiiij dozen and 8 of course dyap[er] napkins.
- Holland. iiij pa: & j od sheete of fine holland of 2. breadthes & di' of R:S:
 iiij pa: of Courser holland sheetes of 2. breadthes of E: C:
 [att Hatfeild] j drawne worke sheete wrought wth blacke silke.
 j face Cloth of Lawne wth gould and silver lace and [these 2 words interlined] fringe.
 j other wth greene & ~~gould~~ gould.
 j plaine wthout any worke of E: C:
 iiij pa: of pillowbeares & j od wrought wth gould silke & silver.
 j other wrought pillowbeare.
 [j-att Hatfeild] v greate shirt bagges of satten of divers sortes imbrodred wth gould and silver.
 [2-att Hatfeild] viij sweete Bagges imbrodred of diverse sortes.
 j other plaine.
 vj pa: of fine holland pillowbeares plaine
 xxvij yardes of Course newe holland.

j att hatfeild. ix Cubbord Clothes of Course Holland.

vj Towells of Course holland .

[~~the sheetes att hatfeild~~] j pa: of fine sheetes and a pillowbeare that my Lo: dyed in
vj fine holland shertes whereof three unmade up.✓

APPENDIX IV

TYPES OF COPY

Copies and Variants: defining terms

At least 18 different types of copies or variants have been identified below for the purposes of this study, although the descriptions given in this list were not used with such precise meanings during the period under discussion. Where copies identified in documents from the period c.1550-1650 survive their presence is indicated by the asterisks in the list.

[A] full-scale precise autograph copies by the original artist and/or from his workshop.

These include paintings from the workshops of such major artists as Titian, Guido Reni and Rubens, where it was generally acknowledged by contemporaries, and sometimes by the artists themselves, that there was considerable participation by members of the workshop in the majority of works produced in those workshops. An example is the three surviving versions of Raphael's portrait of Julius II [National Gallery, Uffizi and Pitti] which have been the subject of much debate, although most scholars would now accept the version in London to be the original, because technical analysis shows extensive changes under the present painted surface, with the Uffizi version probably emanating from the workshop.¹ On the other hand, evidence of underdrawing by itself cannot be accepted as conclusive because it is known that painters making copies would transfer the 'most essential point [which] they connected...with freely drawn lines which constitute the underdrawings'.² Signatures cannot be considered as any guarantee that the master had contributed the majority of the painted surface. A prime example of this would be the version of the Titian *Entombment of Christ* *[Prado] sent to Antonio Perez by the Venetian State.

[B] full-scale precise copies by an artist who was not a member of the original workshop,

where the original was not, or could not be, obtained, are recorded in the collections of François I of France, the Emperor Rudolf II, Cardinal Francesco Maria del Monte*,

¹ For a review of recent literature see Kempers, B., 'The Pope's Two Bodies. Julius II, Raphael and Saint Luke's Virgin of Santa Maria del Popolo' in *The Miraculous Image in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance* eds. E. Thunø and G. Wolf, Rome, 2004, pp.135-159.

² Dijkstra, J., 'Methods for the Copying of Paintings in the Southern Netherlands in the 15th and early 16th Centuries' in *Le dessin sous-jacent dans la Peinture*, VIII, Louvain 1991, eds. H. Verougstraete-Marcq and R. van Schoute, pp.67-76.

Marchese Vincenzo Giustiniani*, Philip IV of Spain*. English collectors of such copies include Charles I*, William Cavendish, 1st Duke of Newcastle*, Algernon Percy, 10th Earl of Northumberland*, Edward Cecil, Viscount Wimbledon, James Hamilton, 2nd Marquess of Hamilton, George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham and at Ham House*. An example is given by Karel van Mander who records that Philip II requested Michiel Coxcie to copy the van Eyck *Altarpiece of the Lamb* [S. Bavo, Ghent], when he failed to obtain the original.³ Coxcie's copy may first have been displayed at the July 1559 meeting of the Order of the Golden Fleece, as the van Eyck altarpiece was seen to date from the same time as the foundation of the Order and thus the copy would help to underline historical continuity and authority.⁴ It was subsequently placed on the high altar of the Alcazar, Madrid and is now divided between museums in Zaragoza, Brussels, Berlin and Munich.⁵ Van Mander records the copy by Coxcie in his life of the van Eyck brothers, saying that 'Coxcie altered a few things after his own fashion – including the Saint Cecilia who, somewhat inelegantly is set too far back. This copy was sent to Spain'. It is unlikely that van Mander could have seen this copy. He also quotes from an ode written by Lucas de Heere, which is more complimentary: 'The famous Michiel Coxcie...has gained and augmented his honour'.⁶

[C] full-scale precise copies where the original was also present in the same collection, usually by other artists, examples include: Philip IV of Spain: *Adam and Eve* original by Titian [Prado], copy by Rubens [Prado]* (by acquisition, not commission);

[D] autograph variants, emanating from the original artist/workshop, sometimes at the request of the original commissioner; copies of portraits were especially common in this category, usually as gifts. An example of this would be the copy of the portrait of Isabella d'Este, Marchioness of Mantua, by Lorenzo Costa, the original of which was given to the English ambassador in 1514; this is sometimes said to be the portrait in the Royal Collection of a *Lady with a Lapdog*, but it is not recorded there before the reign of Charles

³ Two fragments of this were on display in the Bode Museum, Berlin, in August 2008.

⁴ Chipps Smith, J., 'The Practical Logistics of Art: Thoughts on the Commissioning, Displaying and Storing of Art at the Burgundian Court' in *In Detail: New Studies of Northern Renaissance Art in Honour of Walter S. Gibson*, ed. L. Dixon, Turnhout, 1998, pp.27-48.

⁵ Cat. 146, *Felipe II: Un monarca y su época, un príncipe del Renacimiento*, exh. cat., Prado, 1998.

⁶ Mander, K. van., *The lives of the illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters, from the first edition of the Schilder-boeck*, ed. H. Miedema, Doornspijk, 1994-9, 6v., I, f.200v.

II.⁷ A version of the original portrait by Costa was then used by Francesco Francia to produce another image of Isabella, with the assistance of her half-sister's description.

[E] precise miniature copies, which are recorded in the collections of Archduke Ferdinand II [Schloss Ambras], Charles I*, Buckingham*, and at Ham House*. These are likely to have been produced by specialist miniature painters because of the technique involved. For example, Peter Oliver was commissioned by Charles I to produce miniature copies of original full-scale works by Titian, Raphael and Correggio which were also owned by Charles I (Chapter III, pp.149, 157, 189-91).

[F] workshop copies, i.e. those which were known to have no participation by the master.⁸ The existence of this type of copy is acknowledged in Rubens's correspondence with Sir Dudley Carleton in 1618, in which the artist lists his prices and where he refers to workshop copies which have not yet been retouched by him: 'The Twelve Apostles, with a Christ, done by my pupils, from originals by my own hand, which the Duke of Lerma has, each having to be retouched by my own hand throughout'.⁹ The mention of such an important figure as Lerma was no doubt intended to raise the status of the paintings. In the same list was included, 'A Last Judgment, begun by one of my scholars, after one which I did...for the most Serene Prince of Neuberg...would be entirely retouched by my own hand, and by this means will pass as original'. Some of these were priced at the same level as those Rubens identified as originals. In the next letter, he refers to the idea that 'Your Excellency must not think that [they] are mere copies, for they are so well retouched by my hand that they are hardly to be distinguished from originals'.¹⁰ The implication of this correspondence is that there were copies available by his pupils which were not retouched by Rubens. Jacob Jordaens acknowledged that the same process would be involved in 1648, when his client was Queen Christina of Sweden.¹¹

[G] early substitute copies, where for some reason the original is no longer in the place for which it was intended; for example, when Cardinal Ludovico Ludovisi caused the

⁷ *The Art of Italy*, op. cit., no. 30.

⁸ Referred to by Jonathan Brown op. cit. as 'authentic reproductions', which I consider to be too loose a definition.

⁹ Carpenter, op. cit., p.145.

¹⁰ *The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens*, ed. R.S. Magurn, Cambridge, Mass., 1955, pp.59-62.

¹¹ De Marchi and van Miegroet, 1994, p.456.

altarpiece by Francesco Francia to be removed from S. Lorenzo alle Grotte, Bologna, for his collection [now Hermitage], he ensured that a copy was made to replace it.¹² In 1672 Carlo Maratta proposed moving the *Nativity of the Virgin* by Annibale Carracci [Louvre] from its original chapel in the basilica of the Santa Casa, Loreto, because of its condition and it was replaced by a copy.¹³

Another type of substitution occurred in cases where in order to facilitate moving an original a copy is made to “fill the gap”: Michiel Coxcie made 2 copies of Rogier van der Weyden’s *Deposition* [Prado], the first as a substitute when Mary of Hungary bought the original from the Guild of Harquebusiers in Louvain in 1548 [probably lost]. Following the acquisition of the original by Philip II, he made a copy [lost] when it was moved from its first position in the Pardo to the Escorial in about 1566.¹⁴ The original picture was ‘copied on innumerable occasions’ and at least 50 are in existence.¹⁵ There is an early copy in the Capilla Real, Granada, while the version on display in the Bode Museum, Berlin, attributed to Coxcie bears an apparently false date of 1488.

[H] variants, which do not copy the entire original, but select aspects of the original work and might therefore be perceived as something new; in 1695 Pierre Mignard mentioned a painting of the Virgin Mary which he had done ‘after Guido’, but went on to say that he had made so many alterations that it could not be considered as a copy; this was sometimes said to have been done to undermine his rival Charles Le Brun, by getting him to authenticate Mignard’s painting as a Reni and then reveal the truth.¹⁶

[I] a variant which substitutes a different figure, usually a saint, in an altarpiece, while retaining the rest of the composition, probably at the specific request of the patron. An example of this would be the *Pietà* by Domenichino discussed in Chapter Two, p.85.

[J] a variant which selects only 1 or at most 2 figures, entirely divorced from the original context, for repetition and that variant is then extensively repeated; a well-known example

¹² Garas, 1967a, I, 287.

¹³ Posner, op. cit., II, cat. 110.

¹⁴ Powell, A., ‘The Errant Image: Rogier van der Weyden’s *Deposition from the Cross* and its Copies’, *AH*, 29, 4, 2006, pp.540-562; *Felipe II* op. cit., cat.58.

¹⁵ Mund H., ‘Original, Copy and Influence, A Complex Issue’, in Campbell, L. and J. Van der Stock, *Rogier van der Weyden: 1400-1464 Master of Passions*, Zwolle, 2009, pp.186-205.

¹⁶ Spear, 1997, p. 247; Brewer, op. cit., p.202; this book does not include full citations of sources.

of this would be images based on Guido Reni's heads of Christ, many excerpted from his *Cappuccini Crucifixion* (original, Bologna Pinacoteca), but others from alternate Reni paintings; when Reni himself made a copy of this painting for Cardinal Gessi, he produced a variant.¹⁷

[K] a variant which deviates from the original, by adding extraneous figures, such as an anonymous one in the Prado after Raphael's *Madonna di Loreto* [Chantilly], with the addition of an angel with a basket of flowers, or deviates by extending half-length figures into whole-lengths, such as the triptych of 1588 by Gabriel Cárdenas Maldonado, where the central panel (modelled on Raphael's *Madonna of the Rose* [Prado]) is treated in this way and extraneous wings are added.¹⁸ A copy of van der Weyden's *Deposition* of about 1443 survives [Edelheer Triptych, St. Peter's, Louvain] with extraneous wings adding a family who are depicted as though the patrons (which they were not).

[L] oversize copies, which were sometimes executed in other media: for example, St. Peter's, Rome, contains a mosaic copy of Raphael's *Transfiguration* which is about 3 times larger than the original and "corrects" the darkness of the original. Ten of the original C17th altarpieces in St. Peter's were replaced by mosaic copies after 1680, such as Guercino's *S. Petronilla*, 1621-3, replaced in 1730.¹⁹ Only one altarpiece was originally executed in mosaic: *The Archangel Michael* by G.B. Calandra, but it is a copy of a painting by the Cavaliere d'Arpino, a fact which was ignored by (or unknown to) its seventeenth-century admirers such as John Evelyn, for whom its technical perfection was the main attraction. The decision to use mosaic here may have been because paintings were suffering badly from the unsuitable, damp, conditions in the church, although some felt that instead of copying it would be preferable to commission new paintings, which would have the virtue of being originals and much cheaper.²⁰ The result is that only one original painted altarpiece remains in situ: Pietro da Cortona's *Trinity* of 1628-32;

[M] reduced, but not miniature, versions, which may be presentation copies, sometimes made with cheaper oil pigments and which are unlikely to be the work of specialist

¹⁷ *The Agony and The Ecstasy* op. cit.; Spear 1997, p.233.

¹⁸ *Rafael en España*, op. cit., nos. 12 and 16.

¹⁹ Rice, op. cit., pp.110, 170.

²⁰ *Ibid.* p.157.

miniature painters. In 1570 Duke Guidobaldo della Rovere was asked to specify both the size and support of the copy of Raphael's *Transfiguration* [Vatican] commissioned from Federico Zuccaro, while in 1581 Marchese Camillo Capilupi, seeking a copy of a copy of a Raphael, requested that it be 'più grande che sia possibile', but set a limit on how much he was willing to pay.²¹ Annibale Carracci is one of the artists to whom a reduced copy of Titian's *St. Peter Martyr* altarpiece [destroyed, discussed on page 68, Chapter Two] has been attributed, which was on the market in July 2010.²²

[N] "gallery" paintings, which show collections of paintings, a genre which originated in Antwerp. These are sometimes wholly or partly imaginary, such as those produced by Frans Francken II and Willem van Haecht. Those produced by David Teniers II of the collection of the Archduke Leopold Wilhelm may not precisely reflect the hang, but do reproduce paintings known to be in that collection, many formerly in seventeenth-century English collections, especially that of James, 3rd Marquess and (from 1643) 1st Duke of Hamilton (discussed on pages 167-175 in Chapter Three);²³

[O] copies in a variety of drawing media. These provided a useful exercise for the maker and could be used for training assistants; they were saleable and easily portable. They are difficult to trace with certainty in contemporary documents with certainty and will not be discussed in detail here.

[P] tapestry copies, such as that of Leonardo's *Last Supper* [Vatican Museum];

[Q] full-scale copies in plaster or bronze of marble sculpture, such as the full-scale plaster copy of Michelangelo's *Moses* [S. Pietro in Vincoli, Rome] in the collection of the sculptor Pompeo Leoni in Madrid in 1609, which included numerous other casts of ancient and modern sculpture, 'which was highly unusual in Spain', as well as some important paintings (discussed on pages 201-2, Chapter Three);²⁴ such copies were still sought in

²¹ Shearman, *Raphael*, pp.1215-6, 1290-1.

²² With Trafalgar Gallery, London SW1. Meilman, P., *Titian and the Altarpiece in Renaissance Venice*, Cambridge, 2000, Appendix IV, p. 201, no. 1 and Lost Copies no. 1.

²³ see CIA 2006 and *Room for Art in Seventeenth Century Antwerp*, exh. cat. Rubenshuis, 2009.

²⁴ Helmstutler Di Dio, 2006, p.154.

1649 when Philip IV sent Velázquez to Italy to obtain casts, for example the *Farnese Hercules*.²⁵

[R] reduced-scale plaster or terracotta copies of sculpture; e.g. Sansovino's lost copy of the *Laocoön* (discussed on page 62, Chapter Two) or Nicolas Coustou's terracotta copy of the *Borghese Gladiator* 1683 [original and copy, Louvre]

[S] reduced-scale bronze copies of sculpture, which seem to have been particularly useful for the transmission of artistic ideas. For example, at the time that Titian painted the *Bacchus and Ariadne* for Duke Alfonso d'Este's Camerino d'Alabastro in Ferrara [National Gallery], he may have had access to the reduced bronze copy by Sansovino of the *Laocoön* in the Grimani collection, which at approximately the same date as Titian's painting, consisted of the main figure separated from the sons [lost, discussed on page 63].²⁶ The earliest dateable such example is Filarete's bronze copy (1440-1445) of the Marcus Aurelius given to the Elector Christian I of Saxony by Duke Guglielmo Gonzaga of Mantua in 1585 [Staatlichen Kunstsammlungen, Dresden].²⁷

²⁵ Velázquez *Esculturas para el Alcázar*, exh. cat., Madrid 2007.

²⁶ Boucher, op. cit., cat. 83.

²⁷ *Princely Splendor: The Dresden Court 1580-1620*, exh. cat., New York, 2004, p.269.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Place of publication London unless otherwise stated

Abbreviations

AH = Art History

BAJ = British Art Journal

BM = Burlington Magazine

JWCI = Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes

‘Abraham van der Doort’s Catalogue of the Collections of Charles I’, ed. O. Millar, *Walpole Society*, 37, 1958-60.

Alberti, L.B., *On Painting and On Sculpture*, ed. C. Grayson, 1972.

A Mirror of Princes – The Mughals and the Medici, ed. D. Jones, Bombay, 1987.

‘An inventory of her Ma^{tyes} stuffe in Otelandes taken at her Mat^{yes} remove in October 1616’, East Sussex Record Office GLY 315.

‘An inventory of her Ma^{ts} owne stuffe in Oatelands taken y^e day after her remove from thence being the 7th of October 1617’, East Sussex Record Office GLY 319.

Andres, Glenn M., *The Villa Medici in Rome*, 2v., New York, 1976

Andrews, K., ‘Elsheimer’s ‘Latona’ uncovered’, *BM*, 123, 1981, pp.350-1.

Annales or a Generall Chronicle of England begun by John Stow, continued & augmented to 1631 by Edmund Howes, Gent., 1631.

Anne of Denmark: ‘An inventory of her Ma^{ts} owne stuffe in Oatelands taken y^e day after her remove from thence being the 7th of October 1617’, East Sussex Record Office GLY 319

Annibale Carracci’s Venus, Adonis and Cupid, exh. cat. Prado, 2005.

Anselmi, A., ‘Arte Politica e Diplomazia: Tiziano, Corregio, Raffaello, L’investitura di Piombino e notizie su agenti Spagnoli a Roma’ in *The Diplomacy of Art...* op.cit. pp.101-120.

Anthony van Dyck as Printmaker, exh. cat., Antwerp, 1999.

Art Collecting and Lineage in the Elizabethan Age: The Lumley Inventory and Pedigree, ed. M. Evans, 2010

Artistic Exchange and Cultural Translation in the Italian Renaissance City, eds. S.J. Campbell and S.J. Milner, Cambridge, 2004.

Artists' Self-Portraits from the Uffizi, exh. cat. Dulwich Picture Gallery 2007.

Artists' Techniques in Golden Age Spain: Six Treatises in Translation, ed. and translated Zahira Veliz, Cambridge, 1986.

Asian Travel in the Renaissance ed. Daniel Carey, Ren. Studies Special Issue September

Atil, E., *The Age of Suleyman the Magnificent* exh. cat 1987.

Avery, C., 'The Collector Earl & his Modern Marbles: Thomas Howard & François Dieussart', *Apollo*, 163, pp.46-53.

Avery, L., 'Chinese Porcelain in English Mounts', *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*.

A Woman Killed with Kindness and Other Domestic Plays, ed. M. Wiggins, Oxford, 2008.

Ayers, J. ed., *Chinese Ceramics in the Topkapi Saray Museum Istanbul: a complete catalogue*, 3v., 1980, I.

Ayers, J., 'Early Ming Taste in Porcelain' *Victoria and Albert Museum Bulletin*, 2, 1966.

Baart, J.M., 'Ceramic Consumption and Supply in Early Modern Amsterdam: Local Production and Long-distance Trade' in *Work in Towns 850-1850* ed. P.J. Corfield and D. Keene, Leicester, 1990.

Balis, A., '"Fatto da uno mio discepolo": Rubens's Studio Practices Reviewed' in *Rubens and his Workshop: The Flight of Lot and his Family from Sodom*, exh. cat. Tokyo, 1993, pp.97-127.

Bambach, C.C., *Drawing and Painting in the Italian Renaissance Workshop: Theory and Practice, 1300-1600*, Cambridge, 1999.

Banner, L.A., *The Religious Patronage of the Duke of Lerma 1598-1621*, Farnham, 2009.

Banta, A.B., 'A 'Lascivious' Painting for the Queen of England', *Apollo*, 159, June 2004, pp.66-71.

Batho, G.R., 'The Household Papers of Henry Percy, 9th Earl of Northumberland', *Camden Society*, XCIII, 3rd series 1962.

Bauer, L.F., 'A Letter by Barocci and the Tracing of Finished Paintings', *BM*, 128, 1986, pp. 355-7.

Bauer, L., 'Van Dyck, replicas and tracing', *BM*, 149, 2007, pp. 99-101.

Beal, M., *A study of Richard Symonds: his Italian notebooks and their relevance to*

seventeenth century-painting techniques, New York, 1984.

Belevitch-Stankevitch, H. *Le gout chinois en France au temps de Louis XIV*, Paris, 1910.

Belkin, K.L., *Rubens Copies and Adaptations from Renaissance and Later Artists: German and Netherlandish Artists*, 2v., 2009.

Bell, Q., 'Copies and Facsimilies of the Old Masters: Their Uses and Abuses', *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 120, 1973, pp.478-489.

Bellori, G.P., *The Lives of the Modern Painters, Sculptors and Architects, A New Translation and Critical Edition*, A.S. Wohl, H. Wohl, T. Montanari, Cambridge, 2005 and paperback edition 2010.

Belting, H., *Likeness and Presence: A History of the Image before the Era of Art*, Chicago, 1994.

Benjamin W.: *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings*, eds. H. Eiland and M.W. Jennings, 4v., 3: 1935-38 (2002) and 4: 1938-40 (2003).

Bertini, G., *La galleria del Duca di Parma: Storia di una Collezione*, Milan, 1987.

Bertolotti, A., 'Esportazione di Oggetti di Belle Arti da Roma per l'Inghilterra', *Archivio Storico Artistico, Archeologico e Letterario della Città e Provincia di Roma*, IV, Spoleto, 1880, pp.74-90.

Betcherman, L-R., 'Balthazar Gerbier in seventeenth century Italy', *History Today*, 11, 1961, pp. 325-331.

Betcherman, L-R., 'The York House Collection and its Keeper', *Apollo*, 92, 1970, pp.250-259.

Boase, T.S.R., 'An English Copy of a Carracci Altarpiece', *JWCI*, 15, 1952, pp.253-255.

Boime, A., 'Le Musée des Copies', *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, LXIV, October 1964, pp.237-247.

Bolland, A., 'From the Workshop to the Academy: The Emergence of the Artist' in *Renaissance Florence: A Social History*, eds. R.J. Crum and J.T. Paoletti, Cambridge, 2006, pp.454-478.

Borenus, T., 'An Early English Writer on Art', *BM*, 220, 39, 1921, pp.188-195.

Boxer, C.R., 'The Dutch East India Company and the China Trade', *History Today*, 309, November, 1979, pp.741-50.

Boucher, B., *The Sculpture of Jacopo Sansovino*, 2v., 1991.

Boyer, J-C., and I. Volf, 'Rome à Paris: les tableaux du maréchal de Créqui (1638)' in *Revue de l'Art*, 79, 1988, pp.22-41.

Boyer, M., *Japanese Export Lacquers from the Seventeenth Century in the National Museum of Denmark*, Copenhagen, 1959.

- Bracken, S., 'Chyna in England before 1614', *Oriental Art*, 47, 2, 2001, pp.8-10.
- Bracken, S., 'Robert Cecil as Art Collector' in *Patronage Culture and Power: The Early Cecils 1558-1612*, ed. P. Croft, 2002, pp.121-137 ("2002a").
- Bracken, S., 'Copies of Old Master paintings in Charles I's collection: the role of Michael Cross fl. 1632-60', *BAJ*, III, 2002, pp. 28-30 ("2002b").
- Bracken, S. 'The Early Cecils and Italianate Taste', in *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, ed. E. Chaney, 2003, pp.201-219.
- Brewer, J., *The American Leonardo: A 20th-Century Tale of Obsession, Art and Money*, 2009.
- van den Brink, P., 'The Art of Copying: copying and serial production of paintings in the Low Countries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries' in *Brueghel Enterprises*, ed. P. van den Brink, Ghent 2001, pp.12-43.
- Brookes, A., 'Richard Symonds and the Palazzo Farnese, 1649-50', *JoHoC*, 7-8, 1998, pp.39-157.
- Brookes, A., 'Richard Symonds's Account of his Visit to Rome in 1649-51', *Walpole Society*, 69, 2007, pp.1-184.
- Brotton, J., and L. Jardine *Global Interests: Renaissance Arts between East and West* London 2000.
- Brotton, J., *The Renaissance Bazaar: From the Silk Road to Michelangelo* Oxford University Press 2002.
- Brotton, J. and D. McGrath, 'The Spanish acquisition of King Charles I's art collection: the letters of Alonso de Cárdenas, 1649-51', *JoHoC*, 20, 2008, pp.1-16.
- Brown, C. & Ramsey N., 'Van Dyck's Collection – Some new documents', *BM*, 132, 1990, pp.704-708.
- Brummer, H.H., *The Statue Court in the Vatican Belvedere*, Stockholm, 1970.
- Burrell, M., 'Reynolds's Mona Lisa', *Apollo*, 164, September, 2006, pp.64-71.
- Bury, M., *The Print in Italy 1550-1620*, exh. cat., London, 2001.
- Butters, S.G., 'Making Art Pay: The Meaning and Value of Art in Late Sixteenth-Century Rome and Florence', in *The Art Market in Italy 15th–17th Centuries*, eds. M. Fantoni, L. Matthew and S. Matthews-Grieco, Modena, 2003, p.29.
- CSPC East Indies, 1513-1616*, ed. W.N. Sainsbury, 1862.
- Calendar of State Papers, Venice, XVIII*, 1912, ed. A.B. Hinds.

- Cammel, C.R., 'George Villiers, 1st Duke of Buckingham. Portraits of a Great Connoisseur', *Connoisseur*, 97, 1936, pp. 126-132.
- Campbell, T., 'School of Raphael tapestries in the collection of Henry VIII', *BM*, 138, 1996, pp.69-78.
- Campbell, T.P., *Tapestry in the Renaissance: Art and Magnificence*, exh. cat., New York, 2002.
- Caravaggio e i Giustiniani: toccar con mano una collezione del Seicento*, exh. cat. Rome 2001.
- Caravaggio e l'Europa: da Caravaggio a Mattia Preti*, exh. cat. Milan/Vienna 2005/6 & review by Gash, J., *BM*, 148, 2006, pp.57-8.
- Caravaggio: I "Bari" della collezione Mahon*, exh. cat. Forlì, 2008.
- Caravaggio Odescalchi: Le due versioni della 'Conversione di San Paolo' a confronto*, exh. cat. Rome, 2006.
- Caravaggio: The Final Years*, exh. cat., London, 2005.
- Caravaggio: The Master Revealed*, exh. cat. National Gallery of Ireland, 1993-4.
- Carpenter, W.H., *Pictorial Notices, Consisting of a Memoir of Sir Anthony van Dyck*, 1844.
- 'Carpets of the Mediterranean Countries 1400-1600', eds. Pinner, R., and Denny, W.B., *Oriental Carpet & Textile Studies*, II, 1986.
- Carolus*, exh. cat. Ghent, 1999.
- Castelluccio, S., *Les Collections royales d'objets d'art de François I^{er} à la Révolution*, Les Editions de l'Amateur, Paris, 2002.
- Catalogue of Paintings in the Wellington Museum, Apsley House*, revised edition 2009.
- Cavazzini, P., 'Claude's Apprenticeship in Rome: The Market for Copies and the Invention of the Liber Veritatis', *Konsthistorisk tidskrift*, 73, 2004, pp.133-146.
- Cavazzini, P., *Painting as Business in Early Seventeenth-Century Rome*, Pennsylvania, 2008.
- Cecchi, A., 'La Collection de tableaux' in *La Villa Medici*, 4v., Rome 1991, II, Etudes, pp.486-505.
- Checa, F., *Tiziano y la monarquía hispánica: usos y funciones de la pintura veneciana en España (siglos XVI y XVII)*, Madrid, 1994.
- Chew, E., 'The Countess of Arundel and Tart Hall' in *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, ed. E. Chaney, 2003, pp.285-314.
- Chiovenda, L.P.C., 'Una copia ad affresco inedita del Giudizio di Michelangelo', *Palatino*, 8, 1964, pp.149-151.
- Christiansen, K., 'Caravaggio's second versions', *BM*, 134, 1992, pp.502-3.

- Circa 1492: Art in the Age of Exploration* exh. cat. NGA, Washington 1991-2, ed. Jay A. Levenson.
- Clifford, T., 'Polidoro and English Design', *The Connoisseur*, 192, 1976, pp.282-91.
- Clifford Smith, H., 'An Italian Lacquered Table of the 17th Century', *BM*, 29, 1916, pp.153-4.
- Colantuono, A., 'Titian's Tender Infants: On the Imitation of Venetian Painting in Baroque Rome' in *I Tatti Studies: Essays in the Renaissance*, 3, 1989, pp.207-234.
- Colantuono, A., *Guido Reni's Abduction of Helen: The Politics and Rhetoric of Painting in Seventeenth-Century Europe*, Cambridge, 1997.
- Colantuono, A., 'The Mute Diplomat: Theorizing the Role of Images in Seventeenth-Century Political Negotiations', in *The Diplomacy of Art: Artistic Creation and Politics in Seicento Italy*, ed. E. Cropper, Milan, 2000, pp.51-76.
- Collaboration in Italian Renaissance Art*, eds. W.S. Sheard and J.T. Paoletti, 1978.
- Collins, A., *Letters and Memorials of State...*, 2v., 1746,
- Collins, A.J., *Jewels and Plate of Elizabeth I*, 1955
- Coltman, V., 'Representation, Replication and Collecting in Charles Townley's Late Eighteenth-Century Library', *AH*, 29, 2, 2006, pp.304-324.
- Corradini, S., 'Un antico inventario della quadreria del Cardinale Borghese' in *Bernini Scultore: La Nascita del Barocco in Casa Borghese*, exh. cat. Rome, 1998.
- Correggio e l'Antico*, exh. cat. Galleria Borghese, Rome, 2008.
- Costello, J., 'The Twelve Pictures "Ordered by Velasquez" and the Trial of Valguarnera', *JWCI*, 13, 1950, pp.237-284.
- Condivi, A., *The Life of Michelangelo*, trans. A.S. Wohl, Pennsylvania, 1999.
- Cottington's Account Book 1623, National Library of Scotland MS 1879.
- Cowan, B., *The Social Life of Coffee: The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse*, 2005.
- Cowen Orlin, L., 'Fictions of the Early Modern English Probate Inventory' in *The Culture of Capital: Property, Cities, and Knowledge in Early Modern England*, ed. H.S. Turner, 2002, pp.51-83.
- Cox-Rearick 'Sacred to profane: diplomatic gifts of the Medici to Francis I', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies*, 24, 1994.
- Crill, R. 'Angels and Elephants', *Apollo*, 160, 2004, pp.87-91.
- Cropper, E., *The Ideal of Painting: Pietro Testa's Düsseldorf Notebook*, Princeton 1984.
- Cropper, E., 'The Place of Beauty in the High Renaissance', in *Place and Displacement in the Renaissance*, ed. A. Vos, New York, 1995, pp.159-207.

Cropper, E., *The Domenichino Affair: Novelty, Imitation, and Theft in Seventeenth-Century Rome*, 2005.

Crowe, A.T., 'Florimond Robertet – International Politics and Patronage of the Arts' in *Leonardo da Vinci: The Mystery of the Madonna of the Yarnwinder*, ed. M. Kemp, exh. cat. Edinburgh, 1992.

Cust, L. and M.L. Cox, 'Notes on the Collections formed by Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel and Surrey, K.G.', *BM*, 19, 1911, pp.278-286; 20, 1911, pp.97-100, 323-325; 20, 1912, pp.233-236 and pp.341-343; 21, 1912, pp.256-258.

D'Après l'Antique, exh. cat. Louvre, 2001, pp.228-273.

Darley, G., *John Evelyn: Living for Ingenuity*, 2006.

David Teniers and the Theatre of Painting, exh. cat. Courtauld Institute of Art, 2006, ed. E. Vegelin van Claerbergen.

Davies, R., 'An Inventory of the Duke of Buckingham's Pictures, etc., at York House in 1635', *BM*, 10, 1907, pp.376-382.

De Herrera a Velázquez: el primer naturalismo en Sevilla, exh. cat. Seville, 2005.

Devon Inventories of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, Devon & Cornwall Record Society, n.s. 11, Torquay, 1966, pp. 18-19.

Delaforce, A., 'The Collection of Antonio Pérez, Secretary of State to Philip II', *BM*, 124, 1982, pp.742-753.

De Marchi, N. and H.J. Van Miegroet, 'Pricing invention: "Originals," "Copies," and their Relative Value in Seventeenth Century Netherlandish Art Markets' in *Economics of the arts: selected essays*, eds. V.A. Ginsburgh and P-M. Menger, Amsterdam, 1996, pp.27-70.

De Marchi, N., and H.J. Van Miegroet, 'Art, Value, and Market Practices in the Netherlands in the Seventeenth Century', *AB*, 76, 1994, pp.451-464.

Dijkstra, J., 'Methods for the Copying of Paintings in the Southern Netherlands in the 15th and early 16th Centuries' in *Le dessin sous-jacent dans la Peinture*, VIII, Louvain 1991, eds. H. Verougstraete-Marcq and R. van Schoute, pp. 67-76.

Distelberger, R. et al., *Western Decorative Arts, Part I: Medieval, Renaissance, and Historicizing Styles including Metalwork, Enamels, and Ceramics*, The Collections of the National Gallery of Art Washington Systematic Catalogue, 1993.

Domenichino, 1581-1641, exh. cat. Rome, 1996-7.

Dutch and Flemish Paintings III: Flemish Paintings c. 1600-c.1800, (catalogue of the Nationalmuseum Collection), G. Cavalli-Björkman et al, Stockholm, 2010.

Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630, exh. cat. Tate 1995. ed. Hearn, K.

Earle, J., 'Genji meets Yang Guifei: a Group of Japanese Export Lacquers', *TOCS*, 7, 1982-3, pp. 45-75.

Early Travels in India, ed. W. Foster, 1921.

Edwards, R., & P. Ward-Jackson, *Ham House: a Guide*, 1950.

Eikema Hommes, M. van, *Changing Pictures: Discoloration in 15th-17th Century Oil Paintings*, London, 2004.

Ekserdjian, D., 'Parmigianino and Michelangelo' in *Reactions to the Master: Michelangelo's Effect on Art and Artists in the Sixteenth Century*, eds. F. Ames-Lewis and P. Joannides, Aldershot, 2003.

Eleven Letters of William Harvey to Lord Feilding, June 9-November 15 1636, London 1912, letter of 7/17 September (unpaginated).

Encounters: the meeting of Asia and Europe 1500-1800, eds. A. Jackson and A. Jaffer, 2004.

Engass, R., and Brown, J., *Italian & Spanish Art 1600-1750: Sources and Documents*, Evanston, Illinois, 1999.

Falomir, M., 'Artists' Responses to the Emergence of Markets for Paintings in Spain, c.1600', in *Mapping Markets for Paintings in Europe 1450-1705*, eds., N. De Marchi and H.J. Van Miegroet, Turnhout, 2006, pp.135-161.

I Farnese: Arte e Collezionismo, exh. cat. Parma, 1995.

Feigen, R.L., 'The art factory and the death of the connoisseur', *AN*, September, 2008, p.26.

Felipe II: Un monarca y su época, un príncipe del Renacimiento, exh. cat Prado, 1998.

Ferris, J.P., 'A Connoisseur's Shopping-List, 1647', *JWCI*, 38, 1975, pp.339-41.

Filipczak, Z.Z., *Picturing Art in Antwerp 1550-1700*, Princeton, 1987.

Finaldi, G., 'The 'Conversion of St. Paul' and other Works by Parmigianino in Pompeo Leoni's Collection', *BM*, 136, 1994, pp.110-112.

Foister, S., 'Edward Alleyn's Collection of Paintings' in *Edward Alleyn: Elizabethan Actor, Jacobean Gentleman*, exh. cat. Dulwich Picture Gallery, 1994, pp. 33-62. Fontana, J. 'Federico Barocci's Emulation of Raphael in the Fossombrone Madonna & Child with Saints' in *Coming About...A Festschrift for John Shearman*, Cambridge, Mass., 2001, eds., L.R. Jones and L.C. Matthew, pp. 183-190.

Fontana, J., 'Duke Guidobaldo II della Rovere, Federico Barocci and the Taste for Titian at the Court of Urbino' in *Patronage and Dynasty: The Rise of the Della Rovere in Renaissance Italy*, ed. I.F. Verstegen, Kirksville, Missouri, 2007, pp.161-178.

Fucikova, E. ed., *Rudolf II and Prague: The Court and the City*, 1997.

Gallo, M.C., 'The Sauli collection, two unpublished letters and a portrait by Orazio Gentileschi', *BM*, 145, 2003, pp. 345-353.

Garas, K., 'The Ludovisi Collection of Pictures in 1633 – I', *BM*, 109, 1967, pp.287-291 and II *BM*, 109, 1967, pp.339-349 ("1967a").

Garas, K., 'Die Entstehung der Galerie des Erzherzogs Leopold Wilhelm', *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlung in Wien*, 63, 1967, pp. 39-80 ("1967b").

Garlick, K.J., *A Catalogue of the Pictures at Althorp, Walpole Society*, LXV, 1974-1976, Glasgow, 1976.

Garner, Sir H., 'A Group of Chinese Lacquers with Basketry Panels', *Archives of Asian Art*, 20, 1966-7, pp.6-23.

Garner, Sir H., *Chinese Export Art in Schloss Ambras*, 1975

GEC[okayne], *The Complete Peerage*, v.I, 1910.

Gent, L., *Picture and Poetry 1560-1620: Relations between literature and the visual arts in the English Renaissance*, Leamington Spa, 1981.

Gent, L., 'Marcus Gheeraerdt's Captain Thomas Lee' in *Dealing with the Visual: Art History, Aesthetics and Visual Culture*, eds. C. van Eck and E. Winters, Aldershot, 2005, pp.85-108.

Gibson, R., 'The National Portrait Gallery's Set of Kings and Queens at Montacute House', *The National Trust Year Book 1975-6*, pp. 81-87.

'Giovanni di Paolo', *The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, Fall 1988, 46, no. 2.

Glanville, P., *Silver in Tudor and Early Stuart England*, 1990 *CSPC East Indies*, 1513-1616, ed. W.N. Sainsbury, 1862

Gleissner, S., 'Reassembling a Royal Art Collection for the Restored King of Great Britain', *JoHoC*, 6, 1994, pp.103-115.

Goldberg, E.L., 'Artistic Relations between the Medici and the Spanish courts, 1587-1621: Part I', *Documents for the History of Collecting*: 21, *BM*, 138, 1996, pp.105-114.

Goldring, E., 'The Earl of Leicester's Inventory of Kenilworth Castle c. 1578', *English Heritage Historical Review*, II, 2007.

Gonzaga: *La Celeste Galeria, le raccolte*, exh. cat. Mantua, 2002.

- Gould, C., 'The Raphael Portrait of Julius II, Problems of Versions and Variants; and a Goose that turned into a Swan', *Apollo*, 92, September, 1970, pp. 187-189.
- Gould, C., *National Gallery Catalogues: The Sixteenth-Century Italian Schools*, 1975.
- Gould, C., *The Paintings of Correggio*, 1976.
- Grann, D., 'The Mark of a Masterpiece: the man who keeps finding famous fingerprints on uncelebrated works of art', *The New Yorker*, 12-19 July, 2010, pp. 50-71.
- Gray, B., 'The export of Chinese porcelain to India', *Transactions of the Oriental Ceramic Society*, 36, 1964-6, pp.21-37.
- Gregory, S., 'The Unsympathetic Exemplar in Vasari's Life of Pontormo', *Renaissance Studies*, 2008, pp.1-32.
- Grésy, E., 'Inventaire des objets d'art composant la succession de Florimond Robertet Ministre de François I, dressé par sa veuve, le 4 jour d'Août 1532, *Mémoire de la Société Impériale des Antiquaires de France*, 3 ser., X, 1868.
- Gronau, G., *Documenti Artistici Urbinati*, Florence, 1936.
- Grossmann, F., 'Holbein, Flemish Paintings and Everhard Jabach', *BM*, 93, 1951, pp.16-25.
- Gschwend, A.J., 'The Marvels of the East: Renaissance Curiosity Collections in Portugal', in *The Heritage of Rauluchantim*, exh. cat., Lisbon, 1996, pp.83-127.
- Günther, H., 'Michelangelo's Works in the Eyes of his Contemporaries' in *The Beholder: The Experience of Art in Early Modern Europe*, eds. T. Frangenburg and R. Williams, 2006.
- Halliwell, J.O. *Ancient Inventories of Furniture, Pictures, Tapestry, Plate etc. Illustrative of the Domestic Manners of the English in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 1854.
- Hambly, M., *Drawing Instruments 1580-1980*, 1988.
- Handel: A Celebration of his Life and Times 1685-1759*, exh. cat., NPG, 1985.
- Hans Rottenhammer, begehrt-vergessen-neuentdeckt* exh. cat. Lemgo, Prague 2008-9.
- Hanson, C.A., *The English Virtuoso: Art, Medicine and Antiquarianism in the Age of Empiricism*, Chicago, 2009.
- Hard, F., 'Richard Haydocke and Alexander Browne: Two Half-Forgotten Writers on the Art of Painting', *PMLA*, 55, 1940, pp.727-741.
- Hardie, P. 'China's Ceramic Trade with India', *TOCS*, 48, 1983-4, pp.15-31.
- Härting, U., 'Daniel, Bel et le Dragon de Babylone: Un Cabinet à Peintures par Frans Francken II (1581-1642) au Musée Calvet d'Avignon' in *Revue du Louvre*, 1991, pp.33-46.
- Haskell, F., *Patrons and Painters: Art and Society in Baroque Italy*, 1980.

- Haydocke, R., *A tracte containing the artes of curious paintinge*, Oxford, 1598.
- Hayward, M.A. *The 1542 Inventory of Whitehall: Volume I, Commentary*, London, 2004.
- Held, J.S. 'Artis Pictoriae Amator: An Antwerp Art Patron and his Collection' in *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 50, 1957, pp. 53-84.
- Helmstutler Di Dio, K., 'Leone Leoni's Collection in the Casa degli Omenoni, Milan: the inventory of 1609' *BM*, 145, 2003, pp.572-578.
- Helmstutler Di Dio, K., 'The chief and perhaps only antiquarian in Spain: Pompeo Leoni and his collection in Madrid, *JoHoC*, 18, 2006, pp.137-167 and online appendices.
- Helmstutler di Dio, K., 'Diego Fernández Cabrera y Bobadilla and the Capilla Mayor at Chinchón', *BM*, 150, 2008, pp.804-812.
- Helmstutler Di Dio, K., 'Federico Borromeo and the collections of Leone and Pompeo Leoni: A new document', *JoHoC*, 21, 2009, pp.1-15.
- Hervey, M.F.S., *The Life, Correspondence & Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel "Father of Vertu in England"*, Cambridge, 1921.
- Heyd, W. von, *Histoire du Commerce du Levant au Moyen Age*, 2v., Leipzig 1885-6.
- Hickson, S., "'To see ourselves as others see us': Giovanni Francesco Zaninello of Ferrara and the portrait of Isabella d'Este by Francesco Francia', *Renaissance Studies*, 23, 3, pp.288-309.
- Hill, R., 'Ambassadors and Art Collecting in Early Stuart Britain: The Parallel Careers of William Trumbull and Sir Dudley Carleton 1609-25' *JoHoC*, 15, 2003, pp.211-228.
- HMC Downshire, III, p. 369.
- Holmes, M. 'The Elusive Origins of the Cult of the Annunziata in Florence' in *The Miraculous Image in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance*, eds., E. Thunø and G. Wolf, Rome, 2004, pp.97-121.
- Holmes, M., 'Copying Practices and Marketing Strategies in a Fifteenth-Century Florentine Painter's Workshop' in *Artistic Exchange and Cultural Translation in the Italian Renaissance City* eds. S.J. Campbell and S.J. Milner, Cambridge, 2004, pp.38-74.
- Honig, E.A., *Painting and the Market in Early Modern Antwerp*, 1998.
- Honour, H., *Chinoiserie: The Vision of Cathay*, 1961
- Hope, C., 'Titian, Philip II and Mary Tudor' in *England and the Continental Renaissance: Essays in Honour of J.B. Trapp*, ed. E. Chaney and P. Mack, Woodbridge, 1990, pp.53-65.
- Hope, C., 'Titian and some Portraits of Charles V' in *Tizian versus Seisenegger: Die Portraits Karls V mit Hund : Ein Holbeinstreit*, exh. cat., Turnhout, 2005, pp. 89-97.
- Howard, M. and S. Bracken 'Lumley Castle and its Inventories' in *The Lumley Inventory*

and Pedigree, ed. M. Evans, 2010.

Howarth, D., *Lord Arundel and his Circle*, 1985.

Howarth, D., 'Charles I, Sculpture and Sculptors', in *The Late King's Goods*, op. cit., pp.73-113.

Howarth, D., 'Rubens owne portrait' *Apollo*, 132, 1990. Howarth, D., 'William Trumbull and Art Collecting', *British Library Journal*, 20, no. 2 1994, pp. 140-162.

Howarth, D., 'A Question of Attribution: Art Agents and the Shaping of the Arundel Collection' in *Your Humble Servant: Agents in Early Modern Europe*, eds. H. Cools, M. Keblusek and B. Noldus, Hilversum, 2006, pp.17-29.

Humfrey, P., *The Altarpiece in Renaissance Venice*, 1993.

Humfrey, P., *Titian*, 2007 (2007a).

Humfrey, P., *Titian: The Complete Paintings*, Bruges, 2007 (2007b).

Huth, H., *Lacquer of the West: the history of a craft and an industry 1550-1950*, 1971.

Hutt, J., 'A Japanese export lacquer chest in the Victoria & Albert Museum: Some further observations', *Apollo*, 149, March, 1999, pp.22-24.

I Della Rovere nell'Italia delle Corti, eds. B. Cleri, et al, Urbino, 2002.

Il Miracolo di Cana: l'originalità della ri-produzione, exh. cat. Fondazione Giorgio Cini, Venice, 2007.

Impey, O., *Chinoiserie: The Impact of Oriental Styles on Western Art and Decoration*, New York, 1977.

Impey, O., 'Japanese export lacquer of the 17th century', *Lacquerwork in Asia and Beyond*, ed. W. Watson, 1982, pp. 124-58.

Impey, O., *The Early Porcelain Kilns of Japan: Arita in the First Half of the Seventeenth Century*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1996.

Impey, O., *National Art Collections Fund Review*, 1998.

Impey, O., and C. Jörg, *Japanese Export Lacquer 1580-1850*, Amsterdam, 2005.

Ingamells, J., 'Perseus and Andromeda': the provenance', *BM*, 124, 1982, pp.396-400.

Ingamells, J., *The Wallace Collection Catalogue of Pictures: I British, German, Italian, Spanish*, 1985.

Irwin, J., 'A Jacobean Vogue for Oriental Lacquer-Ware', *BM*, 95, 1953, pp.193-5.

Islam and the Italian Renaissance eds. C. Burnett and A. Contadini, London 1999.

Italy in the Baroque: Selected Readings, ed. B. Dooley, New York, 1995.

- Jenkins, S., 'The Use of Art during the Spanish Marriage Negotiations and the Visit of Charles Prince of Wales to Madrid in 1623' MA Report, Courtauld Institute 1989. Jenkins, S. 'An Inventory of His Grace The Duke of Chandos's Seat Att Cannons Taken June the 19TH 1725' by John Gilbert, *Walpole Society*, 67, 2005, pp.93-192.
- Jenkins, S., *Portrait of a Patron: the Patronage and Collecting of James Brydges, 1st Duke of Chandos (1674-1744)*, Aldershot, 2007.
- Jenkins, S., 'Sir Thomas Lawrence and the Duke of Wellington: A portraitist and his sitter', *BAJ*, 8, 1, 2007, pp.63-67.
- Jervis, S., 'Furniture for the First Duke of Buckingham', *Furniture History*, 33, 1997, pp.48-74.
- John Huighen van Linschoten, his Discourses of Voyages into ye Easte & West Indies, Devided into Foure Bookes*, printed at London by John Wolfe.
- Jonckheere, K., 'Supply and Demand: Some Notes on the Economy of Seventeenth-Century Connoisseurship' in *Art Market and Connoisseurship: A Closer Look at Paintings by Rembrandt, Rubens and their Contemporaries*, eds. A. Tummers and K. Jonckheere, Amsterdam, 2008, pp. 69-96.
- Jonson, B. *The Silent Woman or Epicoene*, S. Trussler, ed., 1989.
- Jonson, B., *Timber or Discoveries: Being Observations on Men and Manners*, published 1640-1.
- Jordan, W.B., *Juan van der Hamen y Leon and the Court of Madrid*, 2005.
- Jorg, C.J.A., 'Japanese Export Lacquer: Trade and Imitation' in *Imitation and Inspiration: Japanese Influence on Dutch Art*, ed. Stevan van Raay, Amsterdam 1989.
- Kaufmann, T. DaCosta, *The School of Prague: Painting at the Court of Rudolf II*, Chicago, 1988.
- Kaufmann, T.D., *Court, Cloister and City: The Art and Culture of Central Europe 1450-1800*, 1995.
- Keay, J., *The Honourable Company: a history of the English East India Company*, London, 1991.
- Kemp, M., 'Equal excellences': Lomazzo and the explanation of individual style in the visual arts', *Renaissance Studies*, 1, 1987, pp. 1-26.
- Kempers, B., 'The Pope's Two Bodies: Julius II, Raphael and Saint Luke's Virgin of Santa Maria del Popolo' in *The Miraculous Image in the Late Middle Ages and Renaissance* eds. E. Thunø and G. Wolf, Rome, 2004, pp.135-159.

- Kenseth, J. *The Age of the Marvelous*, exh. cat., Chicago, 1991.
- Kensington Palace and the Porcelain of Queen Mary II: Essays in association with the exhibition China Mania*, eds. M. Hinton and O. Impey, 1998.
- King, D., and D. Sylvester, *The Eastern Carpet in the Western World from the 15th to the 17th Century*, exh. cat., London, 1983.
- Kishlansky, M., *A Monarchy Transformed. Britain 1603-1714*, 1996.
- Kitson, M., *Liber Veritatis*, 1978.
- Klebusek, M., 'Cultural and political brokerage in seventeenth-century England: the case of Balthazar Gerbier' in *Dutch and Flemish Artists in Britain 1550-1800*, ed. J. Roding et al, Leiden, 2003, pp. 73-82.
- Knowles, J., 'Jonson's *Entertainment at Britain's Bourse*', in *Re-Presenting Ben Jonson: Text, History, Performance*, Basingstoke, 1999.
- Kopp, E., and J. Tonkovich, 'The judgment of a connoisseur: P-J. Mariette's annotations to the 1767 Jullienne sale catalogue: part I paintings', *BM*, 151, 2009, pp. 821-824 and online appendix.
- Koortbojian, M., 'Pliny's Laocoön?' in *Antiquity and its Interpreters*, Cambridge, 2000, eds. A. Payne, A. Kuttner and R. Smick, pp.199-216.
- Krahl, R., N. Erbjær, ed. J. Ayers, *Chinese Ceramics in the Topkapi Saray Museum London* 1986.
- Krisztinkovics, B. and M. Korach 'Un antico documento sulla porcellana cinese in Europa', *Faenza*, 53, 1967, pp.27-30.
- Kurz, O., 'Early Art Forgeries: from the Renaissance to the eighteenth century' *Journal of the Royal Society of Arts*, 121, 1974, pp.74-89.
- Land, N.E., *The Viewer as Poet: the Renaissance Response to Art*, Pennsylvania, 1994.
- Langdon, H., *Claude Lorrain*, 1989.
- Lavin, M.A., *Seventeenth-Century Barberini Documents and Inventories of Art*, New York, 1975.
- Le Collezioni Gonzaga: L'Elenco dei Beni 1621-1627*, ed. R. Morselli, Milan/Mantua, 2000.
- Lee, S.E., *A History of Far Eastern Art*, 5th edition, 1997.
- Le Palais Farnèse, III, 3: L'Inventaire du Palais et des Propriétés Farnèse à Rome en 1644*, ed B. Jestaz, Rome, 1994.
- Le San Diego: un trésor sous la mer* exh. cat. Paris, 1994, eds. D. Carré, J-P. Desroches et

F. Goddio.

L'Estasi di Santa Cecilia di Raffaello da Urbino nella Pinacoteca nazionale di Bologna, exh. cat., Bologna, 1983.

Levey, M., *The Later Italian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*, 2nd edition, Cambridge, 1991.

Levey S.M., *An Elizabethan Inheritance: The Hardwick Hall Textiles*, 1998

Libro d'Inventario dei Beni di Lorenzo il Magnifico, eds. Spallanzani, M. and Bertela, G.G., Florence 1992.

Liedtke, W.A., *The Royal Horse and Rider: Painting, Sculpture and Horsemanship 1500-1800*, New York, 1989.

Lightbown, R.W., 'Van Dyck and the Purchase of Paintings for the English Court', *BM*, 111, 1969, pp.418-421.

Lightbown, R.W., 'Oriental Art and the Orient in Late Renaissance and Baroque Italy', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, 32, 1969, pp.228-279.

Lightbown, R., *Secular Goldsmiths' Work in Medieval France: A History*, 1978.

Lightbown, R., 'Charles I and European Princely Collecting' in *The Late King's Goods: Collections, Possessions and Patronage of Charles I in the Light of the Commonwealth Sale Inventories*, ed. A. MacGregor, 1989.

Lingo, S., 'Francesco Maria della Rovere and Federico Barocci: Some Notes on Distinctive Strategies in Patronage and the Position of the Artist at Court' in *Della Rovere* 2007, op. cit., pp.179-199.

Lockyer, R., *Buckingham* 1981.

Loh, M.H., *Titian Remade: Repetition and the Transformation of Early Modern Italian Art*, Los Angeles, 2007.

Loomie, A.J., 'Sir Robert Cecil and the Spanish Embassy', in idem *Spain and the Early Stuarts 1585-1655*, 1996, pp. 30-57.

Longueville, T., *Policy and Paint, Some Incidents in the lives of Dudley Carleton and Peter Paul Rubens*, London, 1913.

Lost Secrets of Flemish Painting, ed. D. Fels, Floyd, VA, 2004.

Lowe, K.J.P. ed., *Cultural Links Between Portugal and Italy in the Renaissance*, Oxford, 2000.

Luzio, A., *La Galleria dei Gonzaga venduta all'Inghilterra nel 1627-28*, Milan, 1913.

- di Macco, M., 'Note su Antonio Mariani detto della Corgna...', in *Studi in onore di Giulio Carlo Argan*, Florence, 1994, pp. 192-217.
- MacGregor, A., *Curiosity and Enlightenment: Collectors and Collections from the Sixteenth to the Nineteenth Century*, 2007.
- Mack, R.E., *Bazaar to Piazza: Islamic Trade and Italian Art 1300-1600*, Berkeley, LA, London 2002.
- Madge, S.J., 'Colonel William Webb, Surveyor-General 1649-1660', *Notes and Queries*, 181, 1941, pp.114-116.
- Madocks, S., 'Trop de beautez découvertes' – New Light on Guido Reni's Late 'Bacchus and Ariadne', *BM*, 126, 1984, pp.542-7.
- Madocks Lister, S., "'Trumperies Brought from Rome": Barberini Gifts to the Stuart Court in 1635' in *The Diplomacy of Art...* op. cit., pp.151-176.
- Mahon, D., 'Fresh Light on Caravaggio's Earliest Period: His 'Cardsharps' Recovered', *BM*, 130, 1988, pp.10-25 and technical appendix by K. Christiansen, pp.26-27.
- Maison, K.E., *Themes and Variations: five centuries of master copies and Interpretations*, 1960.
- Malcolm, A., 'Arte, diplomacia y política de la corte durante las embajadas del conde de Sandwich a Madrid y Lisboa (1660-1668)', in *Arte y Diplomacia de la Monarquía Hispánica en el Siglo XVII* ed. J.L. Colomer, Madrid 2003, pp.161-175.
- Mancini, G., *Considerazioni sulla pittura*, ed. A. Marucchi, 2v., Rome 1956-7.
- Marie de Médicis: un gouvernement par les arts*, exh. cat., Blois, 2003.
- Masters of Seventeenth Century Dutch Genre Painting*, ed. P. Sutton, Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1984.
- Mander, K. van., *The lives of the illustrious Netherlandish and German Painters, from the first edition of the Schilder-boeck*, ed. H. Miedema, Doornspijk, 1994-9, 6v.
- Marks, R. and Williamson, P., eds., *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, exh. cat., 2003.
- Massinelli, A.M. and Tuena, F., *Treasures of the Medici*, 1992.
- Matthew, L.C., 'The Painter's Presence: Signatures in Venetian Renaissance Pictures', *AB*, 80, 1998, pp. 616-646.
- McClellan, A., 'Watteau's Dealer: Gersaint and the Marketing of Art in Eighteenth-Century Paris', *AB*, 1996, 78, pp.439-453.
- McEvansoneya, P., 'A note on the Duke of Buckingham's inventory', *BM*, 128, 1986, p.607.

- McEvansoneya, P., 'An unpublished inventory of the Hamilton collection in the 1620s and the Duke of Buckingham's pictures', *BM*, 124, 1992, pp.524-526.
- McEvansoneya, P., 'Van Dyck and the Duchess of Buckingham's Collection', *Apollo*, 140, 1994, pp.30-2.
- McEvansoneya, P., 'The Sequestration and Dispersal of the Buckingham Collection', *JoHoC*, 8, 1996, pp.133-154.
- McEvansoneya, P., 'Vertue, Walpole and the Documentation of the Buckingham Collection', *JoHoC*, 8, 1996, pp.1-14.
- McEvansoneya, P., 'Italian Paintings in the Buckingham Collection' in *The Evolution of English Collecting: Receptions of Italian Art in the Tudor and Stuart Periods*, ed. E. Chaney, 2003, pp.315-336.
- Measure for Measure*, The New Cambridge Shakespeare, ed. Brian Gibbons, Cambridge, 1991.
- Meder, J., *The Mastery of Drawing*, translated and revised by W. Ames, 2.v., New York, 1978, pp.397-9.
- Medley, M., 'Chinese Ceramics and Islamic Design' in *The Westward Influence of the Chinese Arts from the Fourteenth to the Eighteenth Century* ed. William Watson, London. 1972.
- Meilman, P., *Titian and the Altarpiece in Renaissance Venice*, Cambridge, 2000.
- Memorial Historico Español*, 13, Madrid, 1861.
- Merrifield, M.P., *Medieval and Renaissance Treatises on the Arts of Painting: Original Texts with English Translations* (reprint New York 1999).
- Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, Winter 2003, New York.
- Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin*, Fall 2008, New York.
- Meyer zur Capellen, J., *Raphael: A Critical Catalogue of his Paintings, II: The Roman Religious Paintings ca. 1508-20*, Landshut, 2005.
- Michahelles, K-R., 'Catherine de Medici's 1589 Inventory at the Hôtel de la Reine in Paris', *Furniture History*, 38, 2002.
- Miedema, H., 'The Appreciation of Paintings around 1600' in *Dawn of the Golden Age: Northern Netherlandish Art 1580-1620*, exh. cat., Amsterdam, 1993, pp.122-135.
- Michel, P., 'Rome e la formation des collections du cardinal Mazarin', *Histoire de l'art*, 22, 1993 .
- Michelangelo's Last Judgment*, ed. M.B. Hall, Cambridge, 2005.
- Millar, O., 'An Exile in Paris: The Notebooks of Richard Symonds' in *Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art Presented to Anthony Blunt on his 60th Birthday*, London 1967, pp.157-164.

- Mills, J., *Carpets in Paintings*, London, 1983.
- Modesti, A., 'Patrons as Agents and Artists as Dealers in Seicento Bologna', in *The Art Market in Italy...*, op. cit.,
- Moir, A., *Caravaggio and His Copyists*, New York, 1976.
- Montias J.M., *Art at Auction in 17th Century Amsterdam*, Amsterdam, 2002.
- Morrison, K.A., *English Shops and Shopping: An Architectural History*, 2003.
- Mould, P. 'Gainsborough Dupont...Copying van Dyck', *BAJ*, 7, 2006, pp.45-54.
- Muller, J., 'Con Diligenza, Con Studio and Con Amore': Terms of Quality in the Seventeenth Century' in *Rubens and his World*, eds. A. Balis et al, Antwerp, 1985, pp.273-278.
- Muller, J.M., *Rubens: The Artist as Collector*, Princeton, 1989.
- Mund H., 'Original, Copy and Influence, A Complex Issue', in Campbell, L. and J. Van der Stock, *Rogier van der Weyden: 1400-1464 Master of Passions*, Zwolle, 2009.
- Negro, E., and N. Roio, *Francesco Francia e la sua Scuola*, Modena, 1998.
- Newman, J., 'A draft Will of the Earl of Arundel', *BM*, 122, 1980, pp.692-696.
- Nicolini, F., *L'art napoletana del Rinascimento e la lettera di Pietro Summonte*, Naples, 1925, pp.160-1.
- Nuttall, W.L.F., 'King Charles I's Pictures and the Commonwealth Sale', *Apollo*, 82, 1965, pp. 302-309.
- Of household stuff: the 1601 inventories of Bess of Hardwick*, 2001.
- O'Malley, M., 'Late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century painting contracts and the stipulated use of the painter's hand' in *With and Without the Medici: Studies in Tuscan Art and Patronage 1434-1530*, eds. E. Marchand and A. Wright, 1998.
- O'Malley, M., *The Business of Art: Contracts and the Commissioning Process in Renaissance Italy*, Yale, 2005.
- O'Malley, M., 'Quality, Demand, and the Pressures of Reputation: Rethinking Perugino', *AB*, 89, 2007, pp.674-693.
- Oppé, A.P., *English Drawings: Stuart and Georgian Periods in the Collection of H.M. the King at Windsor Castle*, 1950.
- Orazio and Artemisia Gentileschi*, exh. cat., New York, 2002.
- Ormrod, D., 'The Rise of the London Art Market, 1660-1760' in *Economia e Arte Secc. XIII-XVIII*, ed. S. Cavaciocchi, Prato, 2002, pp.303-321.

Osborne, T., 'Van Dyck, Alessandro Scaglia and the Caroline court: friendship, collecting and diplomacy in the early seventeenth century', *The Seventeenth Century*, 22, 2007, pp.24-41.

Ostrow, S.F., *Art and Spirituality in Counter-Reformation Rome: The Sistine and Pauline Chapels in S. Maria Maggiore*, Cambridge, 1996.

Oudry's Painted Menagerie: Portraits of Exotic Animals in Eighteenth-Century Europe, ed. M. Morton, exh. cat., Los Angeles, 2007.

Painted Ladies: Women at the Court of Charles II, exh. cat., London, 2001.

Passavant, J-D., *Raphael d'Urbino et son Père Giovanni Santi*, Paris, 1860.

Payne, M.T.W., 'An inventory of Queen Anne of Denmark's 'ornaments, furniture, household stuffe, and other parcells' at Denmark House, 1619', *JoHoC*, 13, 2001, pp.23-44.

Pearsall Smith, L., *The Life and Letters of Sir Henry Wotton*, 2v., Oxford, 1907.

Peck, L.L., 'Building, Buying and Collecting in London', in *Material London, ca. 1600*, ed. L.C. Orlin, Philadelphia, 2000.

Peck, L.L., *Consuming Splendor: society and culture in seventeenth-century England*, Cambridge, 2005.

Penny, N., *National Gallery Catalogues: The Sixteenth Italian Paintings, II, Venice 1540-1600*, 2008.

Pepper, D.S., *Guido Reni: A Complete Catalogue of his works*, Oxford, 1984.

Philip, I.G., 'Balthazar Gerbier and the Duke of Buckingham's Pictures', *BM*, 99, 1957, pp.155-6.

Philippe de Champaigne 1602-1674: Entre politique et devotion, exh. cat., Lille 2007.

Phillips, C.J., *History of the Sackville Family*, 2v., 1929.

Pigman, G.W., 'Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance', *Renaissance Quarterly*, 33, 1980, pp.1-32.

Piper, D. 'Some Portraits by Marcus Gheeraerts II and John de Critz Reconsidered', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society*, 20, 1960, p. 214.

Poglayen-Neuwall, S., 'Titian's Pictures of the Toilet of Venus and their Copies', *AB*, 16, 1934, pp.358-384.

Pon, L., *Raphael, Durer, and Marcantonio Raimondi*, 2004.

Pons, S.S., 'Las relaciones artísticas entre Italia y Sevilla durante el primer tercio del siglo XVII' in *De Herrera a Velázquez: el primer naturalismo en Sevilla*, exh. cat., Seville,

2005, pp.53-68.

Porcelain for Palaces: The Fashion for Japan in Europe 1650-1750, exh. cat., London, 1990.

Portier, F., 'Prices Paid for Italian Pictures in the Stuart Age', *JoHoC*, 8, 1996, pp.53-69.

Posner, D., *Annibale Carracci: A study in the reform of Italian painting around 1590*, 1971, 2v.

Postle, M., 'Naked Authority? Reproducing Antique Statuary in the English Academy from Lely to Haydon' in *Sculpture and its Reproductions*, op. cit., pp.79-99.

Pots & Pans: a Colloquium on Precious Metals and Ceramics in the Muslim, Chinese and Graeco-Roman Worlds, ed. M. Vickers, Oxford, 1985

Powell, A., 'The Errant Image: Rogier van der Weyden's *Deposition from the Cross* and its Copies', *AH*, 29, 2006, pp.540-562.

Princely Splendor: The Dresden Court 1580-1620, exh. cat., New York, 2004, p. 269.

Puttfarken, T., 'The Dispute about Disegno and Colorito in Venice: Paolo Pino, Lodovico Dolce and Titian' in *Kunst und Kunsttheorie 1400-1900*, eds. P. Ganz et al, Wiesbaden 1991, pp.75-95.

Puttfarken, T., *The Discovery of Pictorial Composition: Theories of Visual Order in Painting 1400-1800*, Yale, 2000.

Queen Elizabeth's Wardrobe Unlock'd: The Inventories of the Wardrobe of Robes prepared in July 1600, ed. J. Arnold, Leeds, 1988

Rafael en España, exh. cat., Madrid, 1985.

Raphael et la Seconde Main, exh. cat., Geneva, 1984.

Raphael: from Urbino to Rome, exh. cat., London, 2004.

Readings in Italian Mannerism, ed. L. De Girolami Cheney, New York, 1997.

'Relations of Golconda in the early seventeenth century', ed. W.H. Moreland, *Hakluyt Society*, second series, 66, 1930.

Remembrances of Things Worth Seeing in Italy given to John Evelyn 25 April 1646 by Thomas Howard, 14th Earl of Arundel, ed. J.M. Robinson, 1987.

Rewald, J., *The Paintings of Paul Cézanne: A Catalogue Raisonné*, 1996, 2v.

Riccardi-Cubitt, M., 'The Duke of Buckingham's *cabinet d'amateur*: an aesthetic, religious and political statement', *BAJ*, 1, 2000, pp. 77-86.

Rice, L., *The Altars and Altarpieces of New St. Peter's: Outfitting the Basilica 1621-1666*, Cambridge, 1997.

- Ridolfi, C., *Le Maraviglie dell'Arte*, Venice, 1648, ed. D. von Hadeln, 2v., Berlin 1914-1924.
- Rinaldi, S.M., 'Paintings by Palma Il Giovane in British Collections', *Apollo*, 110.
- Rogers, J.M. and Ward, R.M., *Suleyman the Magnificent*, J.M. Rogers and R.M. Ward eds., exh. cat., London, 1988.
- Room for Art in Seventeenth Century Antwerp*, exh. cat., Antwerp, 2009.
- Rosenberg, P., 'Watteau's Copies After the Old Masters', in *Watteau and His World: French Drawing from 1700 to 1750*, exh. cat., New York, 1999, pp.50-55.
- Röthlisberger, M., *Claude Lorrain: The Paintings*, 2v., 1961.
- Röttgen, H., *Il Cavalier Giuseppe Cesari D'Arpino: un grande pittore nello splendore della fama e nell'inconstanza della fortuna*, Rome, 2002.
- Rubens: A Genius at Work*, exh. cat., Brussels, 2007.
- Rubens: A House of Art*, exh. cat., Antwerp, 2004.
- Rubens: Drawing on Italy*, exh. cat., Edinburgh, 2002.
- Rubin, P., *Giorgio Vasari: Art and History*, 1995.
- Rubin, P., 'Signposts of Invention: Artists' Signatures in Italian Renaissance Art', *AH*, 29, 2006, pp.563-599.
- Rye, W.B. *England as Seen by Foreigners*, London, 1865.
- Safarik, E.A., *Domenico Fetti 1588/89-1623*, exh. cat., Mantua, 1996.
- Sainsbury, W.N., *Original Unpublished Papers Illustrative of the Life of Sir Peter Paul Rubens*, 1859.
- Sainsbury, W.N., 'Artists patronized by King Charles II', *Fine Arts Quarterly Review*, n.s. 2 (1867), pp.319-34.
- Salort, S. and S. Kubersky-Piredda, 'Art Collecting in Philip II's Spain: the role of Gonzalo de Liaño, king's dwarf and Gentleman of the Bedchamber: part I', *BM*, 148, 2006, pp.660-665.
- Sanderson, W., *Graphice: The use of the Pen and Pensil or the most excellent art of Painting in two parts*, 1658.
- Schnapper, A., 'Probate Inventories, Public Sales and the Parisian Art Market' in *Art Markets in Europe 1400-1800*, eds. M. North and D. Ormrod, Aldershot, 1998, pp.131-141.
- Schroth, S.W., 'The Duke of Lerma's Palace in Madrid: a reconstruction of the original setting for Cristoforo Stati's *Samson and the Lion*', *Apollo*, 154, August, 2001, pp.11-21.
- Schwartz, H., *The Culture of the Copy: Striking Likenesses, Unreasonable Facsimiles*,

New York 1998.

Scott, J., *The Pleasures of Antiquity: British Collectors of Greece and Rome*, Yale, 2003.

Scott, R.E. and R. Kerr, *Ceramic Evolution in the Middle Ming Period: Hongzhi to Wanli (1488-1620)*, exh. cat., London, 1994.

Screech, T., 'Pictures (the Most Part Bawdy)': The Anglo-Japanese Painting Trade in the Early 1600s', *AB*, 2005, pp.50-72.

Sculpture and its Reproductions eds. A. Hughes and E. Ranfft, 1997.

Seddon, P.R., 'Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset', *Renaissance and Modern Studies*, XIV 1970,

Sécheval, A. le Pas de, 'Les collection Ludovisi et la politique artistique royale française au XVII^e siècle. Une tentative d'achat à la fin du règne de Louis XIII', *Revue de l'art*, 94, pp. 69-73.

Sells, A. Lytton, *The Paradise of Travellers: The Italian Influence on Englishmen in the Seventeenth Century*, 1964.

Shakeshaft, P., *The English Ambassadors in Venice 1604-1639*, MA Report Courtauld Institute 1979.

Shakeshaft, P., 'Elsheimer and G.B. Crescenzi', *BM*, 123, 1981, pp.550-1.

Shakeshaft, P., 'To much bewiched with thoes intysing things': the letters of James, third Marquis of Hamilton and Basil, Viscount Feilding, concerning collecting in Venice 1635-1639', *BM*, 128, 1986, pp. 114-134.

Shearman, J., *Andrea del Sarto*, 2v., Oxford, 1965.

Shearman, J., *Raphael's Cartoons in the collection of Her Majesty the Queen and the tapestries for the Sistine Chapel*, 1972.

Shearman, J., *The Early Italian Pictures in the Collection of Her Majesty the Queen*, Cambridge, 1983.

Shearman, J., *Raphael in Early Modern Sources (1483-1602)*, 2v., 2003.

Shirley, E.P., 'An Inventory of the Effects of Henry Howard, K.G, Earl of Northampton, taken on his death in 1614', *Archaeologia*, 42, 1869, pp.347-378.

Shulsky, L.R. 'Chinese Porcelain in Spanish Colonial Sites in the Southern Part of North America and the Caribbean', *TOCS*, 63, 1998-9, pp.83-98.

Shulsky, L.R., 'Philip II of Spain as Porcelain Collector', *Oriental Art*, 44, 1998, pp.51-4.

Sir John Harington's A New Discourse of a Stale Subject, called the Metamorphosis of Ajax, a Critical Annotated Edition by E.S. Donno, 1962. pp.174-5.

Smuts, R.M., 'Art and the material culture of majesty in early Stuart England' in *The Stuart Court and Europe*, ed. R.M. Smuts, Cambridge, 1996, pp.86-112.

- Sonino, A.S., *Cabinet d'Amateur: Le Grandi Collezioni d'Arte nei Dipinti dal XVII al XIX Secolo*, Milan, 1992.
- Sparti, D.L., 'The dal Pozzo Collection again: The Inventories of 1689 and 1695 and the Family Archive', *BM*, 132, 1990, pp.551-570.
- Spear, R.E., *The Divine Guido: Religion, Sex, Money and Art in the World of Guido Reni*, 1997.
- Spear, R.E., 'Di Sua Mano', in *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, Supplementary Volumes*, I, Michigan, 2002, pp.79-98.
- Spear, R., 'Scrambling for Scudi: Notes on Painter's Earnings in Early Baroque Rome', *AB*, 85, 2003, pp.310-320.
- Spear, R.E., 'What is an original?' in *The Italians in Australia: Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art*, ed. D.R. Marshall, Florence 2004.
- Spear, R.E. and P. Sohm, *Painting for Profit: The Economic Lives of Seventeenth-Century Italian Painters*, 2010.
- Spiers, W.L., 'The Note-book and Account Book of Nicholas Stone', *Walpole Society*, VII, 1918-19.
- Spriggs, A.I., 'Oriental Porcelain in Western Paintings 1450-1700', *TOCS*, 36, 1967, pp.73-87.
- Springell, F.C., *Connoisseur & Diplomat: The Earl of Arundel's Embassy to Germany in 1636*, 1963.
- Squarzina, S.D., 'The collections of Cardinal Benedetto Giustiniani. Part I', *BM*, 139, 1997, pp.766-791.
- Starkey, D., ed., *The Inventory of King Henry VIII: The Transcript*, v.I, 1998.
- Stechow, W., 'Peter Paul Rubens's "Deborah Kip, Wife of Sir Balthasar Gerbier and Her Children"', *Studies in the History of Art*, Washington, 1974.
- Strachan, M., *Sir Thomas Roe 1581-1644, a Life*, Wilton, 1989.
- Ströber, E., 'The Earliest Documented Ming Porcelain in Europe: A Gift of Chinese Porcelain from Ferdinando de' Medici (1549-1609) to the Dresden Court', *ICF&S Yearbook 2004*, pp.26-35.
- Strong, R., *Henry, Prince of Wales and England's Lost Renaissance*, 1986
- Stuffman, M., 'Les tableaux de la collection de Pierre Crozat: Historique et Destinée d'un Ensemble Célèbre, Établis en partant d'un Inventaire après Décès Inédit (1740)', *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, 72, Juillet-December, 1968, pp. 11-144.
- Süleyman the Magnificent*, exh. cat., London, 1988, eds. J.M. Rogers and R.M. Ward.

- Sweetman, J., *The Oriental Obsession: Islamic Inspiration in British and American Art and Architecture 1500-1920*, Cambridge.
- Szanto, M., 'Gli itinerari delle pitture dall'Italia alla Francia nel primo Seicento: dalle vie diplomatiche ai circuiti bancari', in *The Art Market in Italy...* op. cit., pp. 413-418.
- Talley, M.K., *Portrait Painting in England: Studies in the Technical Literature before 1700*, Guildford, 1981.
- Tea Drinking in the West*, exh. cat. Nagoya, 2001.
- The Age of Caravaggio and the Carracci*, exh. cat., New York, 1985.
- The Age of Correggio and the Carracci: Emilian Painting of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, exh. cat., Washington, 1986.
- The Agony and The Ecstasy: Guido Reni's Saint Sebastians*, exh. cat., Dulwich Picture Gallery, eds. P. Boccardo and X.F. Salomon, Milan, 2007
- The Arcimboldo Effect: Transformations of the Face from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, exh. cat., Venice, 1987.
- The Art Market in Italy 15th-17th Centuries*, eds. M. Fantoni, L. Matthew and S. Matthews-Grieco, Modena, 2003.
- The Art of Italy in the Royal Collection: Renaissance and Baroque*, eds. L. Whitaker & M. Clayton, exh. cat., London, 2007.
- The Arundel Collection, *Apollo*, 144, August, 1996 (whole issue).
- The Cecil Family Collects: Four Centuries of Decorative Arts from Burghley House*, ed. O. Impey, Alexandria, Va., 1998.
- The Dawn of British Trade to the East Indies as Recorded in the Court Minutes of the East India Company...* ed. Henry Stevens, London 1886.
- The Diary of John Evelyn*, ed. E.S. de Beer, 6 v., Oxford, 1955.
- 'The Diary of the journey of Philip Julius, Duke of Stettin Pomerania through England in the Year 1602', ed. Dr. G. von Bulow, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, n.s. VI, 1892, pp.1-67.
- The Diplomacy of Art: Artistic Creation and Politics in Seicento Italy*, eds. E. Cropper et al., Milan, 2000.
- The East India Company Journals of Captain William Keeling and Master Thomas Bonner 1615-17* eds., M. Strachan and B. Penrose, Minneapolis 1971.
- The Elements of Architecture: Collected by Henry Wotton, Knight, from the best Authors and Examples*, 1624.
- The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe to India, 1615-19*, ed. Sir W. Foster, London 1926 (1st ed.

1899).

The Embassy of Sir Thomas Roe to the court of the Great Moghul 1615-19, ed. W. Foster, 1967 reprint.

‘The Furnishing and Decoration of Ham House’, eds. P. Thornton and M. Tomlin, *Journal of the Furniture History Society*, 16, 1980 (whole volume).

The History of the Great and Mightie Kingdom of China, trans. R. Parke, 1588.

The Inspired Copy: Artists Look at Art, exh. cat., Baltimore, 1975.

‘The Inventories and Valuations of the King’s Goods 1649-1651’, ed. O. Millar, *Walpole Society*, 43, 1970-72.

The Italians in Australia: Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art, ed. D.R. Marshall, Florence 2004.

The Journal of Sir Roger Wilbraham, Camden Miscellany, 10, 1902, pp. 22-3.

The King’s Drawings from the Musée du Louvre, exh. cat. Denver, 2006.

The Letters of Peter Paul Rubens, ed. R.S. Magurn, Cambridge, Mass., 1955.

The Letters of Sir Walter Raleigh, eds. A. Latham and J. Youings, Exeter, 1999,

The Lives of Caravaggio by Giorgio Mancini, Giovanni Baglione and Giovanni Pietro Bellori, with an introduction by Helen Langdon, 2005.

The Note-book and Account Book of Nicholas Stone, by W. L. Spiers, *The Walpole Society*, 7, 1918-1919.

‘The Original Writings & Correspondence of the Two Richard Hakluyts’, ed. E.G.R. Taylor, I, *Hakluyt Society*, 1935.

The Origins of Museums: The Cabinet of Curiosities in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Europe, eds., O. Impey and A. MacGregor, 2nd edition, 2001.

‘The Painter’s Manual’ of Dionysius of Fourna, trans. P. Hetherington, revised reprint 1981, Sagittarius Press.

The Port and Trade of Early Elizabethan London: Documents, B. Dietz, ed., London Record Society no. 8, 1972.

The Print in Stuart Britain 1603-1689, exh. cat., London, 1998.

The Private Collection of Edgar Degas, exh. cat., New York, 1997.

The Sale of the Century: Artistic Relations between Spain and Great Britain, 1604-1655, eds. J. Brown and J. Elliott, Madrid, 2002.

The Treasure Houses of Britain, exh. cat., Washington, 1985.

The Wrestling Boys, exh. cat., Burghley House, 1983, ed. G. Lang.

Thomas, A., *The Painter’s Practice in Renaissance Tuscany*, CUP, 1995.

Thomson, P., 'Lucy Countess of Bedford as a collector of Paintings', *Notes and Queries*, 21/2/1948, pp. 70-71.

Thomas Platter's Travels in England 1599, trans. C. Williams, 1973.

Tintoretto, exh. cat., Madrid, 2007.

Tiziano, exh. cat., Madrid, 2003.

Tiziano e il ritratto di corte da raffaello ai carracci, exh. cat. Naples, 2006.

Towards a new Laocoön, exh. cat., Leeds, 2007.

Trading Places: The East India Company and Asia 1600-1834, exh. cat., London, 2002, ed. Anthony Farrington.

Trapier, E. du Gué, 'The School of Madrid and Van Dyck', *BM*, 99, 1957, pp.265-

Trapier, E. Du Gué, 'Sir Arthur Hopton and the interchange of paintings between Spain and England in the seventeenth century', *The Connoisseur*, 1967, 164, pp.239-243 and 165, pp.60-63.

Trattato dell'Arte della Pittura Scultura ed Architettura di Gio. Paolo Lomazzo, Pittore del XVI Secolo, diviso in sette libri, 3v., Rome 1844.

Trinchieri Camiz, F., 'The Roman 'studio' of Francesco Villamena', *BM*, 136, 1994, pp.507-516.

Trnek, H., 'Exotica in the Kunstkammers of the Hapsburgs: Their Inventories and Collections' in *Exotica: The Portuguese Discoveries and the Renaissance Kunstkammer*, exh. cat., Lisbon, 2001.

Uylenburgh & Son: Art and commerce from Rembrandt to de Lairese 1625-1675, exh. cat., Dulwich, 2006.

Van Dyck Paintings, exh. cat., Washington, 1990.

Van Dyck and His Age, exh. cat., Tel Aviv 1995-6.

Van Dyck 1599-1999: Conjectures & Refutations, ed. Hans Vlieghe, Turnhout, 2001.

Van Dyck: A Complete Catalogue of the Paintings, eds. S.J. Barnes et al., 2004.

Varner, E.R., 'Reading Replications: Roman Rhetoric and Greek Quotations', *AH*, 29, 2, 2006, pp. 280-303.

Van Houdt, T., 'The Economics of Art in Early Modern Times: Some Humanist and Scholastic Approaches' in *Economic Engagements with Art*, eds., N. De Marchi and C.D.W. Goodwin, Durham NC, 1999, pp.303-331.

Vasari, G., *Vite de gli Architettori, Pittori et Scultori*, Florence, 1550, 2v.

Vasari, G., *Il Libro delle Ricordanze*, ed. A. del Vita, Arezzo, 1938.

Giorgio Vasari 'Lives of the Painters, Sculptors and Architects' trans. G. du C. de Vere, 1996, 2 v.

Vassallo e Silva, N., 'Precious Objects and Marvels: the Goa-Lisbon Trade' in *Exotica: The Portuguese Discoveries and the Renaissance Kunstkammer*, exh. cat., Lisbon, 2001, pp.27-37.

Velázquez *Esculturas para el Alcázar*, exh. cat., Madrid, 2007.

Venice Città Excelentissima: *Selections from the Renaissance Diaries of Marin Sanudo*, eds. P.H. Labalme and L.S. White, Baltimore, 2008.

Verdi, R., *Nicolas Poussin*, exh. cat., London 1995.

Vergara, W.A., 'The Count of Fuensaldaña and David Teniers: Their Purchases in London after the Civil War', *BM*, 131, 1989, pp.127-132.

Verheyen, E., 'Jacopo Strada's Mantuan Drawings of 1567-8, *AB*, 49, pp.64-70.

Vermeulen, F., 'The Art of the Dealer: Marketing Paintings in Early Modern Antwerp' in *Your Humble Servant: Agents in Early Modern Europe*, eds. H. Cools, M. Keblusek and B. Noldus, Hilversum, 2006, pp.109-119.

Vertue Note Books II, *Walpole Society*, XX, 1931-2.

Vicini, M.L., *Guido Reni e il Guercino: Due Artisti, Due Opere dalla Corte della Regina di Francia al Palazzo del Cardinale Bernardino*, Rome, 2002.

Villa Medici: il Sogno di un cardinale, collezioni e artisti di Ferdinando de' Medici, exh. cat. Rome, 1999.

Volker, T., *Porcelain and the Dutch East India Company*, Leyden, 1954.

Waldman, L.A., 'Nanni di Baccio Bigio at Santo Spirito', *Mitteilungen des Kunsthistorisches Institutes in Florenz*, 42, 1998, pp.198-204.

Waldman, L.A., *Baccio Bandinelli and Art at the Medici Court: A Corpus of Early Modern Sources*, Philadelphia, 2004.

Walker, J., *Bellini and Titian at Ferrara: A Study of Styles and Taste*, 1956.

Watanabe-O'Kelly, *Court Culture in Dresden from Renaissance to Baroque*, Basingstoke, 2002.

Waterhouse, E.K., 'Paintings from Venice for Seventeenth-Century England: Some Records of a Forgotten Transactions', *Italian Studies*, VII, 1952, pp.1-23.

Watson, W., *The Arts of China 900-1620*, Yale, 2000.

Welch, E., *Shopping in the Renaissance: Consumer Culture in Italy 1400-1600*, Yale, 2005.

Wethey, H., *The Paintings of Titian*, 3v., 1969-75.

- White, A., 'A Biographical Dictionary of London Tomb Sculptors c. 1560-1660', *Walpole Society*, 61, 1999.
- Whitehouse, D., 'Chinese Porcelain in Medieval Europe', *Medieval Archaeology*, 16, 1972, pp.63-78.
- Wild, A., *The East India Company: trade and conquest from 1600*, London, 1999.
- Wilks, T., 'The Picture Collection of Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset (c.1587-1645), Reconsidered', *JoHoC*, 1, 1989, pp.167-177.
- Wilks T., 'Paying Special Attention to the Adorning of a Most Beautiful Gallery': The Pictures in St. James's Palace, 1609-49', *The Court Historian*, 10, 2005, pp.149-172.
- Wilks, T., *Prince Henry Revived: Image and Exemplarity in Early Modern Europe*, 2007.
- Williams, R., 'The Vocation of the Artist as seen by G.B. Armenini', *AH*, 18, 1995, pp.518-536.
- Williams, R.L., 'The Reformation of an Icon: "Portraits" of Christ in Late-Tudor England' in *Art Re-formed: Re-assessing the Impact of the Reformation of the Visual Arts*, eds. T. Hamling and R.L. Williams, Newcastle, 2007.
- Williamson, G.C., *George 3rd Earl of Cumberland*, Cambridge, 1920.
- Wilson, T., 'Renaissance Ceramics' in Rudolf Distelberger et al *Western Decorative Arts, Part I: Medieval, Renaissance, and Historicizing Styles, Including Metalwork, Enamels, and Ceramics* Collections of the National Gallery of Art: Systematic Catalogue, Milan, 1993, pp 119-241.
- Wine, H., *The Seventeenth Century French Paintings*, National Gallery Catalogue, 2001.
- Wittkower, R., 'Nanni di Baccio Bigio and Michelangelo' in *Festschrift Ulrich Middeldorf*, eds. A. Kosegarten and P. Tigler, 2v., Berlin, 1968, pp. 248-262.
- Wood, A.C., *A History of the Levant Company*, OUP, 1935.
- Wood, C.H., 'The Ludovisi collection of paintings in 1623', *BM*, 134, 1992, pp. 515-523.
- Wood, J., 'Van Dyck's 'Cabinet de Titien': the contents and dispersal of his collection', *BM*, 132, 1990, pp.680-695.
- Wood, J., 'Van Dyck and the Earl of Northumberland: Taste and Collecting in Stuart England', in *Van Dyck 350*, eds., S.J. Barnes and A.J. Wheelock, 1994, pp.281-324.
- Wood, J. 'Padre Resta as a Collector of Carracci Drawings', *Master Drawings*, 34, 1996, pp. 3-71.
- Wood, J. 'Raphael Copies and Exemplary Picture Galleries in Mid Eighteenth-Century London', *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte*, 62 Bd., H.3, 1999, pp. 394-417.
- Wood, J., 'Taste and Connoisseurship at the Court of Charles I: Inigo Jones and the Work of Giulio Romano' in *The Stuart Courts*, ed. E. Cruickshanks, Stroud, 2000, pp.118-140.

[Wood J. 2000a]

Wood, J., 'Orazio Gentileschi and Some Netherlandish Artists in London: The Patronage of the Duke of Buckingham, Charles I and Henrietta Maria', *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art*, vol. 28, 3 (2000-2001), pp.103-128 [Wood J. 2000b].

Wood, J., 'Van Dyck: a Catholic Artist in Protestant England, and the Notes on Painting Compiled by Francis Russell, 4th Earl of Bedford' in *Van Dyck 1599-1999: Conjectures and Refutations* ed. H. Vlieghe, Turnhout, 2001, pp.167-198.

Ydema, O., *Carpets and their Datings in Netherlandish Paintings 1540-1700*, Leiden, 1991.